



Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-076
Friday
19 April 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-076

CONTENTS

19 April 1991

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Delegation Proposes Working CFE Document [TASS]	1
---	---

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

TASS Reports 18 Apr Foreign Ministry Briefing	2
On U.S. Summit, Talks With PRC	2
Cambodian Foreign Minister To Visit	2
On Sympathy for Kurdish Refugees	2
On Nuclear Ammo Withdrawal in CSFR	2
On Kurd Demo in Moscow	3
Criticizes NATO Mediterranean Plan	3
Mexican Foreign Minister To Visit	3
'Vremya' Summarizes Pavlov's London Meetings [Moscow TV]	3
Gorbachev Greets Stanford Ecology Symposium [PRAVDA 15 Apr]	4
Soviet Officials Attend Interpol Conference [IZVESTIYA 10 Apr]	4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Continues Japan Visit, Kaifu Talks	5
2d Round of Talks With Kaifu [IZVESTIYA 18 Apr]	5
Gorbachev 'Very Pleased' With Talks [TASS]	5
Leaders Discuss Peace Treaty [TASS]	6
Ignatenko Reviews 17 Apr Talks [TASS]	6
Gorbachev Meets Japan Socialist Party Leader [IZVESTIYA 18 Apr]	6
Gorbachev Meets Japanese University Students [TASS]	6
Gorbachev Addresses Japanese Business Leaders [PRAVDA 18 Apr]	7
Gorbachev Addresses Japanese Legislature [IZVESTIYA 18 Apr]	13
Gorbachev, Kaifu Exchange Toasts at Dinner [TASS]	18
Kaifu Toast [PRAVDA 18 Apr]	18
Gorbachev Toast [PRAVDA 19 Apr]	19
PRAVDA Reviews Gorbachev's 17 Apr Meetings [18 Apr]	20
Sakhalin Representative Departs Prematurely [Radio Rossii]	21
Muscovites Polled on Gorbachev's Japan Visit [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 15]	22

Southeast Asia & Pacific

U.S. Philippines Bases Not Among Those Closing [Moscow International]	22
---	----

Near East & South Asia

Khowst Fall Indicates Mujahidin 'Consolidation' [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Apr]	22
General on Efforts To Free POW's in Afghanistan [TASS]	23
PRAVDA on Safe Havens, Iraqi Kurds' Plight [17 Apr]	24
Kurdish-Iraqi Conflict in Kurdistan Viewed [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA]	24

East Europe

Official on Poland Troop Withdrawal Talks [IZVESTIYA 16 Apr]	25
--	----

West Europe

Lukyanov Meets French Foreign Minister in Paris [TASS]	26
Planned NATO Rapid Deployment Force Criticized [TASS]	27
Pavlov Meets Finland's Koivisto, FRG's Waigel [TASS]	27

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Commissions, Committees Discuss Crisis Program [Moscow Radio]	28
Shcherbakov Addresses Commission on Crisis Program [Moscow Radio]	28
Resolution Endorses Strike Dialogue Statement [IZVESTIYA 18 Apr]	28
Committees' Statement Calls for Strike Dialogue [IZVESTIYA 18 Apr]	29

Political & Social

Gorbachev, Kryuchkov Visit Honecker in Hospital [Hamburg DPA]	29
Manayenkov Hopes Plenum Will Strengthen Ranks [Moscow Radio]	29
Paper Reports More on Cabinet Crisis Program [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 17 Apr]	29
Kravchenko Expulsion From Union 'Unacceptable' [Moscow TV]	30
Poll Shows Communists' Confidence Reviving [PRAVDA 9 Apr]	30
GLASNOST Publishes Lenin Poll Results [TASS]	31
1992 Press Subscription Procedures Examined [IZVESTIYA 13 Apr]	31
CPSU CC Commission Discusses Party Budget [PRAVDA 11 Apr]	32
TASS Reviews Central Press for 19 Apr	34
TASS Reviews Central Press for 18 Apr	34

Economic

Striking Miners Reach Agreement in Ukraine [AFP]	35
Suspend Strike for Two Days [Moscow Radio]	35
Silayev Holds 'Productive' Meeting With Miners [Radio Rossii]	35
Strike Tensions Run 'High' in Kuzbass [TASS]	35
Moscow's Miners' Solidarity Fund Described [IZVESTIYA 11 Apr]	36
One-Hour Strike in RSFSR Called For 26 April [Moscow Radio]	36
Officials on Reconstruction, Development Bank	37
Gerashchenko on Governors Board [TASS]	37
Pavlov on Joining EBRD [TASS]	37
New Small Bills Reportedly Already Printed [KOMMERSANT No 9]	37
Work on Economic Legislation Viewed [Paris BUSINESS IN THE USSR No 11]	38

Agricultural

CPSU's Stroyev on New Price Policy 'Disaster' [TASS]	39
Paper on Early Apr Weather, Crop Conditions [SELSKAYA ZHIZN 17 Apr]	40

Military

Yazov Examines Issue of Housing for Servicemen [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Apr]	40
Arms Quality, Not Quantity, Termed Preeminent [PRAVDA 11 Apr]	41

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Baltic Residents Urge Extraordinary Congress [TASS]	43
Surprising Novodvorskaya Remarks Cited [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Apr]	43
Sajudis Calls for 'Vigil' at Supreme Council [Radio Vilnius]	43
Issues Appeal [Radio Vilnius]	43

Economic Destabilizing Program in Lithuania Noted [Vilnius International]	44
Landsbergis Addresses Supreme Soviet 28 Mar [EKHO LITVY 30 Mar]	44

RSFSR

Yeltsin Meets UN Secretary Perez De Cuellar [IZVESTIYA 18 Apr]	45
French Spokesman on Meeting [TASS]	45
'Vremya' Reports Meeting [Moscow TV]	45
Colonel Alksnis: Yeltsin 'Destroying Russia' [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Apr]	45
Supreme Soviet Passes Militia Law 18 Apr [TASS]	45
'Centrist Bloc' Nominates Voronin for Presidency [TASS]	46
Tatarstan Postpones Presidential Election [TASS]	46
Nizhniy Tagil Voices No Confidence in Gorbachev [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Apr]	46
Gorbachev Criticized at Leningrad Plenum [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 16 Apr]	46
Expert Panel Discusses RSFSR Ethnic Issues [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 13 Apr]	48
RSFSR Emergency Powers Debate Viewed [KOMсомOLSKAYA PRAVDA 5 Apr]	48
RSFSR Legitimacy, Power Structure Questioned [NOVOYE VREMYA No 13]	50
Diverging Opinions on Cause of Sasovo Explosion [PRAVDA 15 Apr]	52
Radio Rossii Status, Plans Discussed [IZVESTIYA 12 Apr]	52
RSFSR Foreign Minister Receives FRG's Dregger [TASS]	53
*Communists of Russia' Anticrisis Program [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Apr]	53

Western Republics

Further Reportage on Ukrainian Strikes 16-17 Apr	61
Supreme Soviet Bans Strikes 16 Apr [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Apr]	61
Legislative Session on Strike Noted [IZVESTIYA 18 Apr]	62
Striking Workers' Demands Met [TASS]	62
Ukrainian Central Committee Plenum Held [PRAVDA 16 Apr]	62
Kiev Union Council Urges Price Rise Compensation [Kiev International]	63
Russian-Ukrainian Relations Examined [PRAVDA UKRAINY 23 Mar]	63

Caucasus

Further Reportage on South Ossetia Situation	66
'Vremya' on Tskhinvali Conflict [Moscow TV]	66
Towns Reportedly Shelled [TASS]	66
Villagers Block N Caucasus Highway [Tbilisi Radio]	67
State of Emergency Only Solution [PRAVDA 12 Apr]	67
Gamsakhurdia: Shevardnadze Not Welcome [Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER 3 Apr]	67
Georgian 20 Mar Law on Changes to Constitution [VESTNIK GRUZII 3 Apr]	68
NKAO Republic Committee Member on Goals [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 28 Mar]	69
Mutalibov Interviewed on Perestroika [Moscow TV]	71

Central Asia

Nazarbayev Cited on Possible Price Increases [IZVESTIYA 15 Apr]	74
CPSU'S Dzasokhov Cited on Talks in Kazakhstan [Moscow TV]	74
Kazakh Anti-Nuclear Movement Implements Programs [TASS]	74
Kyrgyz President Criticizes Draft Union Treaty [Moscow International]	75
Akayev Says Kyrgyzstan at 'Breaking Point' [TASS]	75
Tajikistan's Makhkamov on Price Reform Impact [Moscow TV]	75

Delegation Proposes Working CFE Document

*LD1804180191 Moscow TASS in English 1322 GMT
18 Apr 91*

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Smelov]

[Text] Vienna April 18 TASS—Progress reached during contacts between leaders of countries taking part in talks on Conventional Forces in Europe (CFE) offers a chance to overcome remaining differences, according to participants in the first plenary meeting of the third round of the Vienna talks, which will discuss troop numbers, aerial inspections and stabilisation measures.

A compromise acceptable for everyone would be welcome, participants said.

The past few months saw sharp fluctuations in the climate at the talks. After a euphoria following the successful completion of the treaty last November, several participants panicked after confronting the first difficulties in its implementation, Soviet chief negotiator Oleg Grinevskiy told TASS.

Expectations of the collapse of the European disarmament process froze all work. Meanwhile, the tasks put by state and government leaders at the Paris summit remain in force and very little time remains for their implementation, Grinevskiy said.

It is extremely important to begin work immediately, he added.

Today, the Soviet delegation presented a working document on stabilisation measures, which, experts believe, would make negotiations much more concrete.

The Soviet side proposed that all military activity involving more than 40,000 troops, or 800 combat tanks, or 1,500 armoured vehicles, or 800 artillery systems or 400 combat aircraft or 150 assault helicopters at one time in areas covered by the treaty be banned.

The signatories will be limited to no more than six military activities a year, involving a lesser number of forces but more than 13,000 troops.

The document also envisages mutual information about military activities and other measures.

TASS Reports 18 Apr Foreign Ministry Briefing**On U.S. Summit, Talks With PRC***LD1804182491 Moscow TASS in English 1802 GMT
18 Apr 91*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Postanogov, Sergey Ryabikin, Sergey Nikishov]

[Excerpts] Moscow April 18 TASS—The Soviet Union and the U.S. have agreed on a possible summit at the end of the first six months this year, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman told a news briefing in Moscow today.

"No doubt, the meeting must be capped with major results, including the signing of the treaty on reduction of strategic offensive weapons", Yuriy Gremitskikh continued.

The third round of Soviet-Chinese talks on mutual reduction of troops and military confidence-building in the border area was held in Moscow between April 4 and 18. Gremitskikh said the sides had agreed to start shortly the elaboration of a general document covering a whole package of problems dealing with armed forces cuts.

Speaking on the settlement process in Guatemala, he expressed hope that "the plan to establish comprehensive peace in the country, recently advanced by President Jorge Serrano, will give impetus to the negotiating process and provide the basis for elaborating decisions, capable of putting an end to the armed conflict. [passage omitted]

On proposals to put Saddam Husayn on international trial, he said the question of international legal consequences of the Gulf crisis was closely studied by members of the United Nations Security Council as they worked out its decisions and found "adequate reflection in Resolution 687". [passage omitted]

The spokesman commented on the April 12 statement by South Korean defense minister about the possibility of using South Korean commandos to strike at nuclear facilities of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. Following the condemnation of this statement by the DPRK, Seoul called it "an accidental slip of the tongue". In this context, Gremitskikh said, the Soviet side believes that it is very important to refrain from any statements and actions that could raise tensions in Korea.

Cambodian Foreign Minister To Visit*LD1804163191 Moscow TASS in English 1412 GMT
18 Apr 91*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—Cambodian Foreign Minister Hor Namhong will start his two-day working visit to the USSR on April 23, Yuriy Gremitskikh, a Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman, told a briefing here.

It is Hor Namhong's first visit to the Soviet Union as foreign minister. He earlier worked in Moscow as Cambodian ambassador.

"Further development of political contacts between the two countries, economic cooperation issues, the settlement of the Cambodian problem, as well as other questions of mutual interest will be discussed during his meetings in Moscow, the spokesman said.

On Sympathy for Kurdish Refugees*LD1804153491 Moscow TASS in English 1455 GMT
18 Apr 91*

[By TASS correspondents Sergey Postanogov, Sergey Ryabikin, and Sergey Nikishov]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—"The Soviet Union deeply sympathises with Kurdish refugees, who find themselves in a desperate situation on the Iraqi border with Turkey and Iran and are experiencing tremendous suffering," Soviet Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh said at a briefing here today.

"We support wholeheartedly international efforts, aimed at improving the situation of the refugees, and believe that as many countries as possible should take part in rendering assistance to them, primarily those which possess sufficient financial and other resources and which are interested in an early stabilisation of the situation in the Gulf area."

Speaking about the initiative of the United States, Britain and France for creating several refugee camps in the valleys of northern Iraq to render assistance to Kurdish refugees and for sending their troops to that area, Gremitskikh stressed that the Soviet Union "regards this emergency step primarily as one brought about by an extremely tense situation." He believes that now it is the most realistic opportunity to save the lives of hundreds of thousands of Kurdish refugees, taking into account that later they will return to their places of permanent residence.

The Soviet spokesman also pointed out that the problem has some "delicate aspects" connected with the temporary use of foreign troops because of the "inability of civilian national services and international organisations to cope quickly with a problem of this magnitude." The use of troops should follow only humanitarian purposes and should not infringe upon the sovereign rights of Iraq, he stressed.

The Soviet spokesman expressed hope that Baghdad would regard the situation primarily from the point of view of humanitarian considerations and the need for saving as soon as possible the refugees who found themselves in a desperate situation.

On Nuclear Ammo Withdrawal in CSFR*LD1804170791 Moscow TASS in English 1602 GMT
18 Apr 91*

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Postanogov, Sergey Nikishov, and Sergey Ryabikin]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—A small amount of Soviet nuclear ammunition was deployed on that part of Czechoslovak territory where the units of the Central

Group of troops was located in accordance with the Soviet-Czechoslovak intergovernmental agreement.

However, the last round of nuclear ammunition was withdrawn from Czechoslovakia in March 1990, Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today.

He was commenting on Czechoslovak Defence Minister Lubos Dobrovsky's statement, published by Czechoslovak newspapers on April 17, in which the minister confirmed that there had been Soviet nuclear bases on Czechoslovak territory in the past.

On Kurd Demo in Moscow

LD1804162991 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT
18 Apr 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Postanogov, Sergey Ryabikin, and Sergey Nikishov]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—Kurds held a demonstration outside the Foreign Ministry building in Moscow on Thursday, Foreign Ministry spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing today.

The demonstration was held mainly by Kurdish students studying in the Soviet Union, who are not Soviet citizens. The main goal, according to protestors, was "to attract Soviet public attention to dramatic events in Iraqi Kurdistan, to the suffering of Kurds living in northern Iraq."

Gremitskikh told journalists that a representative of the Soviet Foreign Ministry met and talked with the protestors. He set out Soviet position with regard to the plight of Kurds in northern Iraq.

Gremitskikh also said that the Kurdish community was expected to stage a demonstration in Moscow in the next few days, if it gets authorities' authorization. The participants in today's demonstration outside the Soviet Foreign Ministry were not planning to continue their action and would join the general demonstrations of Kurds, the Soviet diplomat added.

Criticizes NATO Mediterranean Plan

LD1804171691 Moscow TASS in English 1610 GMT
18 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondents Sergey Postanogov, Sergey Ryabikin, and Sergey Nikishov]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—"The expansion of the sphere of actions of military structures of military-political blocs hardly falls in line either with a policy of the formation of a bloc-free European security system, proclaimed by the Paris summit, or with a concept of the transformation of NATO, put forward at its London session," Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh said at a briefing here today.

He commented in this way on a report published by the U.S. newspaper DEFENSE NEWS, which says that the NATO

military committee adopted a decision on the permanent NATO naval presence in the Mediterranean for the purpose of the consolidation of the stability of NATO's southern flank, including Turkey, Italy, Greece, Spain and Portugal.

Speaking about security in the Mediterranean zone, Gremitskikh pointed out that, in the opinion of the Soviet Union, it can be ensured "not by building up naval presence, but by strengthening trust, developing all-round cooperation in various spheres and restricting naval activity." He recalled in this connection the Soviet proposal to create a UN naval force, which could operate in the Mediterranean.

Mexican Foreign Minister To Visit

LD1804183591 Moscow TASS in English 1758 GMT
18 Apr 91

[By TASS diplomatic correspondents Sergey Postanogov, Sergey Ryabikin, and Sergey Nikishov]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—Mexican Foreign Minister Fernando Solana Morales will come to the USSR on a working visit between April 21 and 24.

Soviet Foreign Ministry Spokesman Yuriy Gremitskikh told a briefing here today that Solana will hold talks with Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh.

During the talks, the spokesman noted, much attention will be given to the state of and prospects for the development of bilateral Soviet-Mexican relations having traditionally friendly nature and aimed at constructive interaction to find solutions of major problems of our times and at mutual cooperation in trade, economic, scientific, cultural and other spheres.

It is planned to discuss the signing (in the near future) of some agreements on bilateral cooperation in spheres of mutual interest.

The broad agenda of Solana's talks in Moscow will impart dynamism to a joint search for strengthening Soviet-Mexican relations and bringing bilateral relations to a higher level, which would conform to the potential and tasks of Soviet and Mexican development.

'Vremya' Summarizes Pavlov's London Meetings

LD1604194991 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 1800 GMT 16 Apr 91

[Report by correspondent V. Shishkovskiy from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov, who is in London in connection with the official opening of the European Reconstruction and Development Bank, today met U.S. Treasury Secretary Nicholas Brady. There was a constructive exchange of opinions on questions of Soviet-U.S. economic relations. Mr. Brady expressed the hope of a speedy positive decision by the U.S. Administration to grant credit to the USSR for the purchase of vital goods.

Comrade Pavlov's meeting with Israeli Prime Minister Shamir, at the latter's request, was of great interest to the representatives of the press. A central theme of their conversation, which was held in a pleasant atmosphere, was the question of an all-embracing peaceful settlement to the Arab-Israeli conflict—a settlement that would take into full consideration the just concerns of all parties. An exchange of opinions on a number of questions of bilateral Soviet-Israeli relations also took place.

In the afternoon, Comrade Pavlov paid a visit to Margaret Thatcher, former prime minister of Great Britain. A broad range of international problems and Anglo-Soviet relations were touched upon during a conversation that lasted about an hour.

The USSR prime minister leaves London for Moscow tomorrow.

Gorbachev Greets Stanford Ecology Symposium

PM1704134791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Apr 91 First Edition p 6

[Message from USSR President M. Gorbachev to international symposium at Stanford University]

[Text] To the International Symposium at Stanford University

Almost a year ago now, I met scientists and students from this renowned academic institution which will soon be celebrating its centenary. We also discussed ecological problems at that time. Scientists and politicians agree that mankind's scientific, technical, and economic progress will only materialize in conjunction with the planet's environmental rebirth.

A considerable proportion of this panhuman task involves preserving each people's ethnic originality. Your symposium is also devoted to this problem. It is a difficult problem to preserve the traditional use of nature, characteristic of small peoples who have inhabited the same territories for hundreds of years, in the conditions of mighty scientific and technical development which is uprooting millions of people from their native areas. It is very important that such a prestigious scientific center is tackling this problem.

Let me take this opportunity to point out the emergent Soviet-U.S. environmental cooperation and the accord on the nature-ethnic park on both sides of the Bering Straits.

I wish you all success.

[Signed] M. Gorbachev

Soviet Officials Attend Interpol Conference

PM1504093591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
10 Apr 91 Union Edition p 7

[Report by correspondent L. Krivopalov: "Our Detectives in S. Holmes' Motherland"]

[Excerpts] London—The routine annual conference of Interpol [International Criminal Police Organization] has met in London. Police officials from 30 European countries discussed primarily questions connected with what is expected in 1992, when the boundaries of the EEC states, which are very theoretical even now, are to become purely symbolic.

Special note was made of an element which was in its way sensational—representatives of the USSR, which recently became an Interpol member, took part officially in the work of the conference. [passage omitted]

What does association to Interpol give us in practice? This question was answered for me by our representatives at the London conference—V.P. Gorchakov, chief of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs] International Relations Administration, and G.F. Chebotarev, deputy chief of the USSR MVD Administration for Combating Organized Crime.

Both my interlocutors were convinced that joining Interpol is undoubtedly a positive fact. Our national bureau has already been created and is taking its first steps. There will also be a mission at the Interpol headquarters in London. On the broad plane cadres with a knowledge of foreign languages are required to expand the MVD's international cooperation.

An exchange of information on requirements is being set up. A special channel of communications has been set up. The information is undoubtedly mutually useful. But nor obviously should we overestimate membership of Interpol. It would be an illusion to believe that we have joined it and now it will be possible to put an end to crime almost entirely. This struggle is primarily the responsibility of each individual country. Ultimately Interpol is a mediation bureau: It receives information, processes it on computers, analyzes it, and announces the results of the work done to those member organizations which are interested in it. Interpol performs a large amount of work on the integration of the efforts of policemen of the whole world on the most important salients. But it is question of building up information and working through specific problems.

The idea current in our country that Interpol itself engages in detection is a false one. If Soviet law enforcement organs want, for instance, to ascertain the whereabouts in the West of a particular criminal, Interpol can help. Understandably, it is more difficult with regard to handing over criminals, here everything depends on bilateral relations and so far they can be counted on the fingers of one hand. We are also assisting the police of other countries. Not so long ago "three of our boys" were arrested in Switzerland with counterfeit dollars. When the call had come in, the Soviet side began to investigate what was behind this.

There are other forms of cooperation. This year two international seminars will be held in the USSR with Interpol's participation. Three Soviet reports were presented at the London conference: on the state of crime in the USSR, on export and import operations, and on the "laundering" of money.

Northeast Asia

Gorbachev Continues Japan Visit, Kaifu Talks

2d Round of Talks With Kaifu

CM1804140991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Apr 91 Union Edition pp 1,2

[Unattributed report: "Second Round Of Talks"]

[Text] USSR President M.S. Gorbachev and Japanese Prime Minister T. Kaifu held a second round of talks lasting nearly three hours on the morning of 17 April. It was devoted to the most important international problems. This very fact illustrates the significance of the Soviet-Japanese summit dialogue that has begun.

M.S. Gorbachev set out his vision of cardinal changes in the world. They are connected first and foremost with perestroika in the Soviet Union. At a certain moment, however, many people felt the new reality. The question arose: What is more precious—life, or political battles over who belongs to what system and what ideology they preach? In both the West and the East, people started to become aware of the fact that they belong to one civilization, and the primordial importance of common human values gradually started to reach their consciousness.

The process was an agonizing one. Having taken the decisive step, however, sides which previously confronted each other can now see the important, favorable consequences. Soviet-U.S. mutual understanding made an indispensable contribution to the improvement of the international situation. M.S. Gorbachev gave a justification for the firm attachment of the Soviet leadership to the cooperation that has been achieved in relations with the United States, and paid tribute to President George Bush. The scale of his political thinking and his firmness [nadezhnost] in his positions once he has adopted them. Soviet-U.S. partnership went through a severe test in recent events.

A most important sign of the changes is the all-European process reaching a new level and the totally new nature of relations among the majority of states participating in that process. The effective lifting of the threat of world war has made other world-scale dangers more obvious—among these the dramatic state of backwardness of the countries of the so-called "South." There was discussion in this context of the role and responsibilities of the most economically powerful states represented by the "Seven."

M.S. Gorbachev stressed that Soviet-Japanese relations should fall within the general framework of international joint action by states, particularly the major influential ones, whether dealing with issues of the Asia-Pacific region, the Near East, the world economy, the settlement of regional conflicts of whatever nature, and in this sense the predictability of the policies pursued by each of them is of substantial importance.

The USSR president outlined the reasons for the international significance of perestroika. An understanding of this now represents a most important sign of a new world policy encompassing support for perestroika, especially at the extremely acute stage it is now going through.

During the discussion of the postwar situation in the Persian Gulf and the prospects of an overall settlement in the Near East, a big similarity of views was revealed, including with regard to the role of the mechanisms of the UN, collective actions, the creation of a system of regional security, the Palestinian problem, and ways of ensuring the interests of both the Arabs and Israel.

M.S. Gorbachev and T. Kaifu exchanged opinions on the situation in the Korean peninsula and on the state of the Cambodian settlement. The main approaches here, too, are fairly close.

Replying to T. Kaifu's request that he express his assessment of the second round of talks, M.S. Gorbachev stated that he was satisfied with the scale of the exchange of opinion, that he found in the reflections many coinciding points and considered that this was a good basis for stepping up the political dialogue and cooperation of the USSR and Japan.

Taking part were: A.A. Bessmertnykh, A.N. Yakovlev, K.F. Katushev, N.N. Gubenko, B.M. Isayev, A.V. Kozyrev, A.S. Chernyayev, I.A. Rogachev, L.A. Chizhov; T. Nakayama, M. Sakamoto, H. Owada, N. Hedo, S. Yanai, M. Orita, S. Edamura, M. Togo.

Gorbachev 'Very Pleased' With Talks

LD1704165891 Moscow TASS in English 1629 GMT
17 Apr 91

[Text] Tokyo April 17 TASS—"We arrived in Japan with the firm desire to radically improve relations and with the intention to seek better mutual understanding and work for rapprochement between our people and expand the range of trust," President Mikhail Gorbachev said at the lunch given in his honour by Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu.

Noting that personal relations among statesmen have become a characteristic feature of international activity in recent years, Gorbachev said that in the person of Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu he "found a partner with whom it is possible to talk about the essence of problems without diplomatic circumlocutions and vague phrases." He said this imparted to the Soviet-Japanese dialogue in Tokyo "the necessary power of confidence."

President Gorbachev said that his talks with the leaders of Japan showed "how much could be achieved when the sides were ready to meet each other halfway. I am very pleased that we, with Mr Kaifu, both try to view Soviet-Japanese relations in the context of the world's growing integrity and the interdependence of states. This raises the responsibility for making our relations truly worthy in performing their international function."

Gorbachev recalled that the recent European summit in Paris discussed the prospect for forming a single belt of cooperation in the earth's northern hemisphere. He noted that the plan was not intended for Europe and America to "impose" their order on other countries in that hemisphere, Gorbachev stressed.

The Soviet Union, he pointed out, "does not conceive of this geopolitical space of cooperation and new links among states and nations without the participation of Japan, without, in particular, healthy and full-blooded Soviet-Japanese relations."

Leaders Discuss Peace Treaty

LD1704132591 Moscow TASS in English 1313 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Tokyo April 17 TASS—The Soviet president and Japanese prime minister continued at a one-on-one meeting in the evening a detailed analysis of the main aspects of bilateral relations, and discussed in detail problems related to the peace treaty.

An agreement was reached to hold another narrow-format meeting on April 18, because of the lack of time and the need to fulfill the programme of the visit.

Ignatenko Reviews 17 Apr Talks

LD1704113491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1045 GMT 17 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Prokhorov]

[Text] Tokyo, 17 Apr (TASS)—Western countries should be interested in the success of perestroika in the USSR. If it is not implemented, they will have to expend significantly greater material, intellect, and other resources than for the support of perestroika, USSR President M.S. Gorbachev noted at a meeting held today with Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu. This was reported at a news conference by Vitaliy Ignatenko, USSR presidential assistant and head of the president's press service.

At the meeting, the leaders of the two countries stated that in the 1970s the world found the need to reflect on the situation that had emerged and to make a choice between continuing either the senseless arms race or constructive dialogue and the reduction and elimination of weapons, Vitaliy Ignatenko said, addressing journalists. In this connection, the importance of the restructuring being implemented in the USSR, which has become the main source of the positive changes recently taking place in the world, and of the reorientation toward common human values was stressed. In particular, it has enabled Soviet-U.S. relations to be switched from confrontation and standoff to the plane of cooperation. The dialogue currently taking place in Japan, which will exert a great influence not only on Soviet-Japanese relations but also on the East-West relations as a whole, is likewise of great significance, V. Ignatenko noted.

The presidential assistant also reported that during the talks, the views of the leaders of the two countries coincide on many issues under discussion, which reinforces the hope for the success of the dialogue.

Gorbachev Meets Japan Socialist Party Leader

PM1804134191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 18 Apr 91 Union Edition p 5

[Unattributed report: "M.S. Gorbachev Meeting With T. Doi"]

[Text] On 17 April M.S. Gorbachev had a brief conversation with Takako Doi, chairwoman of the Japan Socialist Party Central Executive Committee. They had met before in Moscow and were familiar with one another's views. Therefore the discussion immediately focused on the significance of the USSR president's visit to Japan and the prospects for Soviet-Japanese relations.

T. Doi pointed out the socialists' role in the establishment of diplomatic relations between the two countries in the past and the fact that her party has always advocated the normalization and improvement of these relations, using the methods of "people's diplomacy," contacts between sister cities, and interparty links. It was acting not on the basis of narrow party goals, but on the basis of national interests.

Endorsing T. Doi's idea, M.S. Gorbachev talked of the significance of public opinion and the mood among the people for the rapprochement of the USSR and Japan and the creation of a benevolent atmosphere in interstate ties. Politicians must rely on this factor in the quest for a solution to existing problems and for new paths in Soviet-Japanese relations.

Some international topics were touched upon, in particular ones relating to the Asia-Pacific region, and mention was made of the topical nature of confidence-building measures there, of military detente, and mutual security.

V.P. Falin and L.A. Chizhov; S. Iwatare and M. Mizuta participated.

Gorbachev Meets Japanese University Students

LD1704145991 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1359 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Tokyo, 17 Apr (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, who is here on an official visit, met today with those who, as he put it, personify the powerful intellectual potential of modern-day Japan, and thus also one of the sources of the "Japanese miracle." He was speaking to professors and students of Japanese universities.

Mikhail Gorbachev noted that the new relations with Japan include not only politics, the economy, and security. They encompass the whole sphere of contact between the two unique cultures, which have made such a significant contribution to civilization. The president

admitted that the history of relations between Russia and Japan, and Japan and the Soviet Union have left a difficult legacy. We cannot get away, he said, from things that remind us of times of alienation and the tragedies of military clashes.

Outlining future prospects, Mikhail Gorbachev voiced the view that the Soviet and Japanese intelligentsia have boundless spiritual areas for cooperation and for the exchange of knowledge toward solving both national and common world problems. He cited as an example the initiative of the international "Message to the Future" foundation, which has proposed the creation of a world video encyclopedia. It would be possible by means of this unique encyclopedia to hand fundamental information on to subsequent generations about the life of people on Earth, their cultural heritage, and its inherent moral potential.

During his speech the USSR president recalled that the Soviets, together with the Europeans and the North Americans, have already taken the first steps toward setting up an unprecedented political-economic and cultural-historical pool—a quest for and cooperation in the northern hemisphere. Progress, however, in Mikhail Gorbachev's view, is unthinkable not only without the Japanese-American and Japanese-European factors, but also without new relations between the USSR and Japan.

A lively discussion flared up between Mikhail Gorbachev and the people taking part in the meeting, in which the fervor of youth resounded and acute issues were not, of course, omitted.

Student Vaseda from the university asked the president: "I think that the most important achievement of your perestroika has been that you have facilitated the implementation of reform, not only from the top but also from below. However, should you, as a result of this successful implementation of perestroika, be forced to leave the post of president by legitimate, democratic means, would you deem yourself obliged to do so?"

Mikhail Gorbachev replied: You know, this is a very simple question for me. It only looks complicated at first glance. I am an ardent supporter of democratic transformations, so that democratic institutions can take shape and function to their full extent in the country. I am an ardent supporter of the establishment of a law-governed state where it is the law that rules, not ochlocracy. Therefore, everything that is decided and is to be decided must be done so within the framework of the Constitution and the law. This must apply to everybody, from the student to the president. Everyone is equal before the law. That is the answer to your question.

Gorbachev Addresses Japanese Business Leaders

CM1804100991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Apr 91 Second Edition pp 1, 4, 5

[Speech by Mikhail Gorbachev to Japanese businessmen in Tokyo on 17 April: "Meeting With Businessmen; Speech by M.S. Gorbachev"]

[Text] Esteemed ladies and gentlemen! I see the fact that we are here in this hall as a good sign, as hope that something will change in this aspect of Soviet-Japanese cooperation as well. I express my satisfaction at this meeting and sincerely greet representatives of Japan's business world.

I see economic relations as the foundation of everything else. We will not play down the importance of human contacts, cultural ties, scientific and technological exchanges, meetings of young people, women, and representatives of various generations—all of those are important. Without that, the normal environment in which political relations can beneficially develop cannot be created. In any event my little experience of working in recent years in the international sphere demonstrates that this really is so.

And yet, economic relations and economic cooperation are the firm ground on the basis of which one can calculate and forecast long-term forms of cooperation in all areas. So, I want to say straightaway: We highly value economic cooperation—from agriculture and forestry to thermonuclear synthesis. And I welcome those joint enterprises, still few and far between, that are putting down deep roots and promising to produce good fruit.

For the moment I will confine myself merely to stating this. Because everything else is merely trade. I am in favor of the development of trade but it has to be bound up and synchronized with economic cooperation. One can hardly regard as normal a situation in which Japan's share of our foreign trade turnover is 2.5 percent. But if we are going to talk about the implementation of joint projects then, in my view, this is all still something for the future. There are already points of contacts, there is joint business, and it has already borne fruit. But it is so insignificant that it bears no comparison with the potential that our peoples, our great nations, possess.

There is a formula on which many discussions have been and are being conducted: the link between politics and economics. I think that if politics contributes to the development of economic relations, and economic relations create a firm base for political dialogue and for the stability of political relations, this formula is acceptable and can be welcomed. But if only a part of the formula is taken, then this looks like a political diktat over economics or an economic diktat with regard to politics. One or other side often wants to use some firm positions in economics as an instrument for political pressure. On the other hand, in the framework of political relations, in this or that alliance, particularly if it has a military-political coloring to boot, economics come under unjustified pressure. And this is not right. In other words, putting the emphasis on one direction or the other can only be justified by some sort of extraordinary circumstances, certain factors, and stages in the development of world politics or of a state. But this is unacceptable from the point of view of normal cooperation for moving international relations into a new, healthy course in the spirit of new thinking.

I believe there is enormous potential for economic cooperation between our countries. I do not know whether there is such potential anywhere else. For the fact is that we are neighbors, just side by side. We can cooperate in an almost homely way. Even so, economic relations are not proceeding in a way comparable with relations in other spheres. And this would appear to be a consequence of the pressure of politics on economic matters.

Of course, it would be possible to continue living without one another. After all, we have done so for 40 years and proved that you can live without us and we without you. If it is necessary to further try to convince also those generations only just acquiring awareness or yet to be born, then things can go on that way. But if we are to think of making life better for those new generations now embarking on their lives and of enabling them to work successfully, attaining greater results than their predecessors, their fathers, and grandfathers, then it would seem to be necessary to think about a new phase in our relations and to shift them to a new level.

It is obvious that all artificial obstacles to fruitful economic cooperation have to be removed. It seems to me that this is in our common interest. All the more so, since a process is now taking place for the regrouping of political forces and the formation of new centers, both economic and political. We are moving toward a very complex world, toward complex interconnections. All of us depend more on one another. And this is no bad thing. The more we depend on one another, the more predictable we are to one another. And if our dependence is economic, then that carries particular weight. So it would seem that, having already embarked on this new phase in world development, we should give some thought to relations between us.

Yesterday I told your prime minister that I would be meeting business people the next day and that I would like to put this direct question to him: Mr. Kaifu, I will be inviting representatives of the business world to help implement major and numerous projects and to participate in wide-ranging cooperation— what will be the stance of the prime minister and his government? The answer, I will say, was for the time being a complicated one. On the one hand, it is positive. But at the same time it was said that every case will be examined individually. Nevertheless, I think that on the whole one can speak of a positive answer. Of course, I am giving you only the substance of his reply.

We realize that there are problems in that our economies do not match up. One of them has been developing in conditions of a supercentralized command system, the other according to the laws of the market. Although it must be said we observe that there are elements of centralism in Japan's economy as well. This is very interesting to us. When we are going along the road of decentralization, we need to see the limits that should not be overstepped. And incidentally, we first heard such advice, such cautions, in public from representatives of

Japan's business world. Some of them, in the capacity of old friends, simply give us a friendly scolding for what we are doing. We have to combine vigorous business, independence, democratism, and economic freedom with elements of centralism, especially as concerns scientific- technological progress, formation of funds to implement structural policy, and so on and so forth. I will not present now all the arguments of the representatives of Japan's business world. We value this advice because this is the opinion of very competent and well-versed people. Moreover, they have their own recent history of "perestroyka," of deep-going modernization in their own country.

Nonetheless, it is natural that in order for it to be possible to cooperate with other countries, in order to set in motion material incentives and increase the activity of our people in external economic cooperation, we need to go over to market relations. We understand that this is a serious matter. I, for my part, always warn our people, our citizens: do not believe those who give you simple prescriptions for this period. These are dangerous people; it is necessary to keep away from them especially in everything that concerns the economy. The change-over to the market is a vast undertaking. Every economy has a certain inertia. And in order to replace one inertia with another it is necessary to do a lot, to lay down other approaches, other incentives, other rules of the game. All of this takes time and, most importantly, it is further necessary for everyone to come to the conclusion that this is essential and begin to restructure their brains. We must make use of people's energy and their entrepreneurial spirit in order to reach a different level of labor productivity.

If you take what our industry has to start with and compare this with what Japan and other countries have, you will see that the initial or the basic resources are often greater in the Soviet Union than in other countries, excluding, maybe, chemical materials and some others. But if we take the end product, the difference is many times greater and not in our favor. So what is the matter—where do the resources disappear on their way to the end product? They disappear because we do not use the right technology, do not work in the right way, do not use the right transportation, the right storage, the right processing. At each of these stages from the raw materials to the finished product, we bear huge losses. We call our economy, and rightly so, significantly wasteful. We expend one and a half to two times more energy and other resources per unit of national income than the developed countries. Therefore, we could have as a minimum a national income one and a half times larger than we have today with the same resources we already possess, without increasing them, and without opening up new regions and making large new capital investments, simply by using the new technologies and new materials combined, of course, with competence and qualifications.

We need to get people's initiative going through economic freedom, through powerful material stimuli. We

have thought about how to do this, we have tried various approaches and methods in recent decades, and in the final analysis we came to the conclusion that this cannot be done unless we combine a person's interest solidly and in economic terms with the interests of the enterprise, and in general link the worker to the land, to the means of production, and—most important—give him the right and the opportunity to have the final product at his own disposal and receive an income on the basis of this, to determine the results and assess how you are working and what you are achieving.

In short, we embarked on the path of reforming property relations to change labor motivation. Our aim is to arrive at a mixed market economy.

The mechanisms of the market are not sufficient of themselves when one is talking about a period of crisis. For this reason we are presently compelled, while implementing the program for transition to the market, and carrying out the reform of property relations—and these processes will now accelerate, creating a market infrastructure—compelled to also make use of measures of an emergency and administrative nature, in order to maintain economic ties, to prevent their disintegration and a catastrophic decline in production. For once production falls, profits fall, and the income of the workers falls too, and the contributions to the budget, via taxes, fall. Hence the whole state will experience colossal difficulties. This is already taking place in our country.

Now we have reached the point where in the framework of our course of transformations—a course aimed at a transition to market relations—we have worked out for the present acute stage of crisis a program of specific anticrisis measures. It is already under examination. We are posing the question of stabilization of economic development by means of tough financial, credit, and monetary policy. We are simultaneously creating conditions for business enterprise, we are getting away from monopolism, command of enterprises, in order to gradually replace distribution with free trade. The present distribution by directive is to be replaced by forms of trade, wholesale and retail. Over 100 commodity exchanges have already been set up, and a contract system is being formed that will interact with the enterprises on deliveries and exchange of resources.

We have carried out a reform of wholesale prices and this month we will carry out a reform of retail prices. This is the most painful stage and society is finding it difficult. We are finding instances of people at a number of enterprises and even whole industries being dissatisfied, acutely dissatisfied at that. But this had to be gone through, because the situation is such that with a ruined market, money loses its meaning. We must take the situation in hand, whatever the cost. Of course, above all we are thinking of what can be done to the maximum, even in these difficult conditions, in order to insure the social protection of the working people, and primarily those who live in poverty.

It must be said that about half the consumer goods and up to 40 percent of the means of production are already being priced on market principles. Yesterday it was the other way round; practically everything was determined from the center.

In this way, an enormous step has been made in this direction in a year or two, an enormous one, perhaps a bigger step than many could stand.

We have passed laws on ownership, on land, on enterprises. Recently the Union parliament passed a law on entrepreneurship in the USSR. Permission has been given for the activity of state, collective, leasehold, private enterprises, and of joint-stock companies and cooperatives. What is on the agenda is to take state property out of state control and privatize it and to transform state enterprises into joint-stock companies. Here we are carefully studying how a similar process went in Japan at one time. It is instructive that they did this gradually—we paid attention to this—and that it was combined with an aspiration to employ the workers that were made redundant.

The fundamental and long-term task is structural change in our economy. Its present structure is immeasurably weighed down, it does not respond well to scientific-technological progress and it is not very oriented toward the production of consumer goods. To a large degree this is linked to the fact that it has been overloaded with defense industries, that the best materials were used there, and that the best cadres, the flower of our science, were concentrated there. In a single country, the defense sector and the civilian sector have been very different from each other; look at it in terms of time: for a whole generation, maybe even one and a half generations. We thus had within our country a domestic Cocom [Coordinating Committee for Multilateral Export Controls] even worse than the one outside.

We are now destroying all of this, creating a different economic environment; and the main thing is that we already have a second variant of the conversion program. So far we are not pleased with it either. We are already thinking about a third variant which, in our view, will be more mature.

The defense sector in our country today is a definite burden for us; but that is also our enormous reserve. And here great possibilities for cooperation are opening up for the business world, on the basis of the creation of joint enterprises. The point is that this sector has both the cadres and the technology as well as great possibilities. Representatives of the business world in other countries, especially German business, are showing interest in this. I understand them.

We are implementing land reform, which should in the final analysis give economic freedom to the peasants. Measures are being taken so that along with collective farms, which will work on new principles and which should operate according to universal market rules,

peasant farms should also develop. We had a big discussion—it has perhaps not yet ended—about whether or not collective farms should exist and about whether we need to disband them all and set up farmers' holdings based on them. Rural inhabitants themselves had a very responsible attitude to the fate of collective farms and state farms, and the main point is that they evidently still want, within the framework of real economic freedom, to see what the collective farm and the state farm can give: You see, our collective and state farms never had economic freedom in all the years of their existence.

All foreign economic practice is now being reformed in accordance with methods accepted in the world economy. New systems of currency regulation have been introduced along with a commercial currency rate. A new customs system has also been created.

Issues are being tackled with regard to demarcating the functions of the republic and the center in this sphere.

Interest has been shown here in matters relating to ownership and how it will be distributed between the republics and the center. Interest has been shown in the convertibility of the ruble. I understand the importance of these problems. We are now about to arrive at a new Union treaty, and this is now a matter for the next two months. It will clarify such complex issues as the demarcation of functions and ownership and will determine who the owner is and with whom one has to deal in economic contacts. Of course there will still be issues, treaties, and projects that will be tackled and implemented at the Union level. A considerable proportion, however, if not the predominant or even the overwhelming proportion, will pass to the jurisdiction of the republics, and many matters relating to foreign economic cooperation will indeed be directly settled with them, with the center playing a coordinating role.

As for the convertibility of the ruble, we previously had in mind its postponement for several years. Now that we have arrived at new prices and have reformed pricing and now that we are opening up more and more to the world, we feel that this problem needs to be tackled more quickly and that this task will probably become the most pressing one. The creation of reliable legal guarantees and the formulation of legislation regulating the import and export of capital are also in the pipeline. The relevant presidential decree has set forth important provisions in this regard, including the fact that enterprises with 100 percent foreign capital may be set up on the Soviet Union's territory.

The question of setting up free economic zones, both from the point of view of determining suitable regions and of providing the necessary legal basis, is being actively studied. At the same time, encouraging conditions for foreign investors of capital must also be envisaged here.

You are, of course, well aware that the government's workload during the country's transition to market relations is extremely great. This compels us to think carefully about each step we take and to thoroughly analyze the possible consequences.

A study of the experience of many countries which have found themselves at stages of profound modernization and a transition to a market economy and major structural changes shows us that someone else's variant and someone else's model have never been adopted anywhere in their pure form. And I think this is right, because to act otherwise would mean committing violence against one's own economy and society. It seems to me that the Japanese example endorses this best of all. On the one hand, Japanese society has opened up in order to absorb all the achievements of civilization; but on the other it has tried to combine them with the traditions, the character, the experience, and all the realities of its own country.

And we, by proceeding from the instructive experience of other countries, are endeavoring to stop our own "dashing horsemen" who always toss up model after model for us—be it Swedish, Brazilian, Japanese, German, Spanish, or Italian. Sometimes this probably depends on what country one is specializing in or what kind of literature one is reading. I think we really should look at and master the experience of other peoples, but we must use it in conformity with the specific conditions of our society and in this way protect ourselves from the disastrous consequences of hasty approaches. Clearly, no transitions can be painless, and this is always difficult. But it is our duty to make ourselves secure from adventurist brainstorming.

Of course, when talking of the economy it is impossible to ignore the stormy political processes taking place in our country in connection with the reform of a multi-ethnic state within the framework of new-found political pluralism and the appearance in the arena of new political forces. All of this is breaking out at the same time; and in the meantime each of these processes taken in isolation is a fundamental change of direction, a real revolutionary change. It is obvious that during such a period, it is not easy to hold course and steer a vessel, and one is forced to maneuver while all the time making sure not to lose sight of the necessary landmarks and following the chosen azimuth of perestroika.

Of course, at such times there are always many who appear who want to take the wheel, and they sometimes steer without being aware of the goals and without knowing the course. Such a danger also exists in our country. It is therefore necessary for all our political processes to take place within a constitutional, democratic framework. Unfortunately, currently we do not have sufficient political culture for this, and nothing is achieved without difficulty.

All the same, we are certain that we will achieve success since we know our history and our people, their ability to

literally rise up from the ashes. We emerged from the Second World War having lost not only 27 million people. The entire developed European part of our country was destroyed, and the nation's health was sapped. Although it was predicted that we would not rise up even in 100 years, we arose. And not only did we arise, but we were able to resolve some of the most major tasks in scientific-technological progress. This says a lot about the potential of the society, the potential of the peoples living in our land.

The roots of our certainty also lie in the fact that our people have come to the conclusion that it is essential to change the forms of life, that it is impossible to go on living the way we have been up to now. We have created a totally new situation through democracy and glasnost. People can put forward ideas, they can compare views and seek solutions. And this, of course, will seriously accelerate progress. We only need to overcome the tendency toward chaos in this great matter of democracy, and we need to establish the preconditions for the speedier formation of a state in which law should rule. While this does not exist, our society is in a feverish state.

A month ago we held an all-Union referendum on the issue of attitudes toward the Union, on whether it should be preserved in its renewed form or not. This is a central issue for our state. It was formed in the space of 1,000 years around the Russian nation, around the Slavs. But today it is a multi-ethnic state where 120 languages are spoken, where there are state formations, moreover not some sorts of things that have arisen mechanically or been formed artificially, but ones that have been created by peoples with a history going back many centuries. Many problems, ills, and grievances have built up in this sphere. We nevertheless see the way out as lying in reform, not in the destruction of our union. There are quite a number of viewpoints on this in our country. Some speak in favor of a commonwealth of nations similar to the current British one, others are in favor of a confederation, a third group is for an association, and a fourth is for a renewed federation. And this is not all; these are only the main points of view, and all of them invoke the will of the people. In such a situation, I propose to the Congress of People's Deputies that the people themselves should be given the chance to say what they want. The congress supported this idea.

There were many battles in the run-up to the referendum, and everyone said all sorts of things to each other, as is probably usually the case during an election campaign. You are well aware of this, because you also clearly have experience of this sort. Nevertheless the people sorted it out. Although they were called on not to take part in the referendum, 80 percent of the electorate took part in it.

Calls were made to vote against the preservation of the Union as a renewed federation of sovereign republics where the rights of all nations and peoples are guaranteed. However, 76 percent of those who took part in the

referendum said "yes." For the first time in our fatherland's history, despite all the tension in the situation in our country. [sentence as received]

I would like to note that perestroika has ceased to be simply our national affair. The way this great reforming process proceeds will seriously affect the fate not only of our peoples, our country, but also of all of civilization because of the huge role played by the Soviet Union.

Thus, I am convinced that we will be able to cope with the present difficulties. Now is the most crucial period. Frankly speaking, I had difficulty finding time to fulfill my agreement with the Japanese leadership to visit your country. Taking into account, however, that this visit is very important and necessary, it was decided to go ahead with it.

We invite you to engage in cooperation. We believe that it is abnormal that two great peoples, two great powers, neighbors who have a need to cooperate, should maintain their relations in the form in which they are today.

I would very much hope that this meeting will be remembered by the representatives of Japan's business world and will cause you to reflect once more. I think that you will come to the same conclusions as we did. After all, cooperation is a mutual affair. And you will travel the same path of coming to understand this which we have traversed. We have come to the conclusion that, even though we can live without one another, it will nevertheless be better if we start cooperating. It will be better for our people and better for our neighbors. Indeed, it is unnatural that at the same time as our cooperation with China, India, Indonesia, and other Asian countries is gathering strength, relations with Japan remain estranged. We believe that this fails to live up to the changes taking place in the world. Meanwhile, consider some interesting projects: fishing and the development of marine resources. Here our interests coincide and much can be done. We expect that Japanese firms will take part in the modernization of our fish processing enterprises, and we will examine the question of quotas from constructive positions. Here too there is extensive scope for interaction.

The sea also means very rich fuel deposits on the shelf. We started cooperating in developing them as long ago as in 1974. However, things are advancing slowly despite the fact that deposits of oil, gas condensate, and natural gas have been prospected and their reserves have been precisely determined. They are sufficient for starting commercial recovery on the Sakhalin shelf, which will be profitable at the forecast level of world prices.

I have already said that the conflict in the Persian Gulf offers the possibility of looking anew at several areas of our cooperation.

We invite Japanese firms to participate in the comprehensive exploitation of the Russian gas and oil deposits in western Siberia in the north of Tyumen Oblast.

Another major joint project may be the exploitation of the Verkhnechonskaya deposit to the north of Baykal.

Many firms from the United States, Canada, Western Europe, and the Republic of Korea have shown interest in these projects. We invite you as well.

In the USSR there is a modernization program for 33 oil refineries with the aim of extending the level of oil refining. We are inviting Japanese firms to 12 of these refineries in the Far East and Siberia.

The situation in which a major uranium supplier—the USSR—and one of the main users of uranium products—Japan—are in no way connected, seems to me illogical.

We have at our disposal a unique and highly economical technology for the enrichment of uranium, and could supply uranium products on the basis of long-term and short-term contracts. We can also export many components for atomic power stations.

I want to draw your attention to the fact that at present we particularly need to purchase your equipment and technology for the production of consumer goods, and we are ready to use for this purpose a considerable portion of the money received from supplying fuel and raw materials.

Japanese business has a traditional interest in our timber resources and in deliveries of commercial timber and raw materials for the paper and pulp industry. We are aware of the complaints about the quality of our supplies. It is therefore all the more important to organize production of timber materials in our country with a high degree of processing.

Finally there is the topic of regional cooperation. You know as well as I do that the Soviet Far East and Siberia are distinguished by their abundance of raw minerals, timber, and other resources and at the same time by their underdeveloped infrastructure. In these areas there are enormous distances and a big shortage of skilled cadres and manpower. On account of this there are great difficulties in their development.

That is why the participation of Japanese firms is extremely desirable for us—initially in expanding the ports of Vostochnyy and Vanino, in the integrated development of railways and highways, including the Baykal-Amur Railroad, and of Khabarovsk and Vladivostok airports, and in arranging modern lines of communication between Khabarovsk, Vladivostok, Nakhodka, and Japan.

Incidentally, I should like to join our Ministry of Railways in expressing gratitude to Japanese railmen.

They have presented Sakhalin with 300 passenger coaches and are about to take part in developing rail tourism in our Far East. That is real business backing for perestroika.

For a long time, both we and you have been speaking of the immense prospects for tourism in the Soviet territories adjacent to Japan; but no progress is being made with the matter. Yet it is simply highly profitable if we arrange jointly to build and run hotels and camp sites, holiday areas, restaurants and cafes—everything that is necessary to provide services for tourists. It is not for me to tell you that it is a particularly quickly self-recouping business.

I have already said that we shall proceed to create free economic zones. The nearest such zone to Japan will be in the vicinity of Nakhodka.

Large and long-term projects call for well-established currency-financial links. Before the 1930's a Japanese bank operated in Vladivostok and efficiently conducted commercial undertakings. We are ready to discuss the question of involving Japanese banks and investment and insurance companies in the Soviet market.

There is quite a good idea on creating a Soviet-Japanese regional development bank that will be open to participation by third countries. And, you know, according to our scientists we have great possibilities for cooperation in high-technology fields.

We are sincerely happy at the success of the first Soviet-Japanese space flight. We should like to develop business ties, starting with the launching of commercial satellites and the carrying out of joint flights, going as far as the creation in near-earth orbit of space laboratories producing super-pure materials.

Immense opportunities for broad co-production and scientific-technical exchange are opening up as conversion proceeds in our defense industry.

I have been told that the Soviet "50 Technologies" exhibition-seminar held recently in Tokyo generated interest among Japanese firms specializing in science-intensive production, including such major firms as Hitachi and Toshiba.

We are ready to back the proposals that have reached us and to expand such cooperation. We probably do not yet know everything about each other.

We are now completing the formation of the appropriate data banks, access to which can be obtained either through the State Committee for Science and Technology or through the All-Union Intersectoral Data Scientific Research Institute. From then on, as they say, it is a question of technology and commercial agreement.

One other thing. We know that the indebtedness of Soviet foreign trade importing organizations is giving rise to serious concern among Japanese firms. We are counting on an understanding of our difficulties in this matter and hope for cooperation as regards rescheduling the payments. There is no need to panic, there is no need to lose confidence; I think that these problems can be solved. If you deal with a power like the USSR, you may have trust in us.

Esteemed ladies and gentlemen! Permit me to summarize my speech in this way.

First, we must not lose time. We need to get mutually beneficial economic cooperation under way for the benefit of both countries.

Second, we can as soon as today move away from traditional forms of cooperation to new ones: joint enterprises, free zones and international consortia.

Third, you will not be making a mistake in taking part in a large-scale program of financial participation in major projects which requires significant investment, particularly to develop the Far East and to create production plants for the thorough processing of raw material resources. We would welcome the participation of third countries in such projects.

Fourth, we will in every way encourage projects for the cooperation of small and medium-sized enterprises, especially for the production of consumer goods. In this way Soviet-Japanese cooperation can gain a particularly energetic impetus.

Fifth, today our cooperation is limited primarily to the sphere of extraction and processing of raw materials.

But the machine-building potential of the USSR, particularly in the defense industry, is enormous and includes leading technology in a number of aspects.

A significant part of this is being included in the process of conversion. Japanese firms can find here efficient partners for the production of modern consumer goods and mass machine-building output.

Japan is probably interested in seeing that conversion in our country, that is, the removal of the excessive militarization of our economy, proceeds more quickly. I think that this coincides with how you conduct matters in your country. This is of common interest.

In a word, the possibilities for mutually beneficial cooperation are enormous. And it is unforgivable to let go the chance which is opening up with the profound transformation of the Soviet economy.

Soviet-Japanese cooperation is changing up a gear and new possibilities are opening up.

Thank you for your attention, and thanks to the organizers for this meeting.

Gorbachev Addresses Japanese Legislature

CM1804140391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Apr 91 Union Edition p 5

[Speech by President Mikhail Gorbachev at the Japanese Diet in Tokyo: "USSR President Addresses Japanese Legislature"]

[Text] Esteemed deputies, ladies and gentlemen. I value highly the invitation to address you, all the more so

because it is, in fact, an address by a head of the Soviet state to the Japanese people, the first in history. The talks with Prime Minister Mr. Kaifu and other statesmen are taking place in a good atmosphere. I think that they will open up a path to new relations between the USSR and Japan. There were no taboo topics. We did not circumvent contentious issues, nor did we shy away from divergences and differences in some of our evaluations. This is a sign of frankness and of the emergence of trust.

The dialogue at summit level, which has at last taken place, signifies the start of the turning point which is so necessary in the interests of both states, and at the same time in interests that are broader, on a regional and world-wide scale.

You, like all Japanese, no doubt, have become accustomed to a situation in which visitors arriving in your country for the first time are carried away by Japan's impressive achievements. I am one of those. And this is not a tribute to protocol. It is to state a fact which is of international significance. It embraces the great love of work, the inexhaustible talents, the traditional discipline, and the new patriotism of the Japanese people. In it there is the correctly chosen political and economic development strategy. You have been able to detect and get astride trends that lead into the 21st century. Without Japan it is unthinkable to imagine modern progress and the new international order—the first steps toward which have already been taken. Hence, indeed, the objective necessity for new Soviet-Japanese relations. [applause]

Precisely from this angle, that is, from the point of view of the significance and possibilities of Soviet-Japanese cooperation, I will begin with general world problems.

To be honest, I would also like to use such a prestigious forum to try to summarize somewhat the profound changes that we have witnessed taking place in the world. Having begun perestroika, which required a review of our entire domestic and foreign policy, we put forward the idea of a comprehensive system of international security in which competition and cooperation would come to replace the arms race and confrontation. Thus, the first stone was laid in the foreign policy concept of the new thinking. Its main elements are, evidently, known to you: The elimination of nuclear weapons and the limitation of conventional weapons to the level of defense sufficiency; respect for each people's and each state's freedom of sociopolitical choice; the primacy of common human values; the exclusion of the messianic approach in world politics; the de-ideologization of relations between states; and national security based on an understanding of the interdependence of all in the world community. The list is incomplete, but the point is that it is precisely this kind of idea that has formed the basis of the constructive, predictable, and clear policy of the Soviet Union. This met a response throughout the world, and predetermined the restructuring of international relations. It opened a path toward the eradication of the cold war.

We have no intention of departing from this policy. All kinds of doubts and speculation which have appeared in the recent period are devoid of foundation. They are either the result of incomprehension, poor information, or they are dictated by ill-will toward us.

The picture of change in the world is striking. What has happened would have seemed simply fantasy several years ago, both in terms of scale and speed. A start has been made on movement, albeit long-lasting and difficult, toward a new era in the life of the world community.

Soviet-U.S. relations are a pivotal element in this process. They have moved from confrontation to cooperation and even partnership. Real disarmament, including nuclear disarmament, has started. The appearance of Europe has altered. The new parameters for its development have been affirmed by the Paris Charter, which was signed at the highest level in 1990.

Germany has become one. The reconciliation between the Soviet and German peoples was an event of historic importance. The foundation has been laid for the development of relations between them on friendly terms. In a word, fundamental progress is evident along the East and West line. This progress inspires the hope that the move toward a new world order will not stop, that perhaps this movement can become irreversible. However, ahead lie quite a few difficulties, dangers, and trials.

The world community has already come through two very serious trials. The first I would conditionally call the destruction of the Berlin Wall, and with it the iron curtain in Europe. Freedom of choice and noninterference in internal processes, a balance of interests, the primacy of political approaches, readiness to take the new realities into account, and an orientation toward what is viable and what leads toward more stable and mutually beneficial relations—all these are criteria for the new relations being built up as well between the countries in the eastern part of Europe.

In this first major test the new political thinking has convincingly shown itself as a factor acting in the interests of the entire world community. Another test is connected with Iraq's aggression against Kuwait, and the crisis in the Gulf. This is the first major international crisis since the end of the cold war. It seems that the world community is coming out of it, having retained the main thing that has arisen in recent years along the road to a new world order. One cannot fail to regret that it was necessary to resort to force, but the aggressor left the United Nations no other choice. The crisis in the Gulf affected the vital interests of many states, including the Soviet Union and Japan. One of the most immediate tasks at the present time is overcoming with fairness its gravest consequences, in the same spirit which guided us in elaborating measures for curtailing the aggression. A settlement, however, goes back directly to the sources of

instability in the region, and requires that the long-standing conflict in the entire Near East be overcome. This is a problem of world order. Here lies the strategic knot of international relations. Here the religions of the world come into immediate contact with one another. In this, one of the energy mainstays of the world economy, the vital interests of many countries cross one another.

The experience acquired during the crisis reaffirms the effectiveness of bilateral and multilateral cooperation in the name of common security and the defense of the principles of the United Nations and of the interests of each of its members.

It also brings out the need for closer cooperation between the Soviet Union and Japan in international affairs, and here I pass immediately to the problems of Soviet-Japanese relations. In general they are not at a standstill. Links exist and function, interest in one another grows. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the level of relations, the pace of their development lag behind both mutual possibilities and requirements, and I hope, our wishes. Why? Permit me to invite the members of the Japanese Parliament to reflect a little.

There is today no area of international activity in which some of us would wish, as a state, to harm the other side, and in which it would be impossible to find mutual interests. Even during the years of the cold war, neither we, in Moscow, nor, as far as we know, those in Tokyo aimed at resolving any problems in our bilateral relations with the use of military force. Naturally, the legacy of the cold war is an enduring one. The lack of trust is still tangible: Despite the fact that the USSR states that it will never attack Japan, fears of the Soviet military threat seem to be gaining the upper hand in Japan. Our new military doctrine, which, naturally, has an eastern dimension, too, proceeds from the principle of exclusively defensive sufficiency. In accordance with the treaty on medium- and short-range missiles, the liquidation of 424 short-range missiles has been completed in the USSR's Asian section, and the 166 medium-range missiles deployed here will have been destroyed by the middle of 1991. Since July 1987, the Soviet Union has not increased the number of nuclear weapons delivery systems in the Asian section of its territory. By 1991, as had been promised, the armed forces in the eastern part of the country were cut by 200,000 men. In the Far East, the ground forces are being cut by 12 divisions. Eleven Air Force regiments are being disbanded. Six warships are being taken out of service from the Pacific Fleet, including nine large naval surface vessels and seven submarines. We are, incidentally, planning to invite military observers to the USSR's Pacific Fleet exercises which will take place in the summer. In 1991 the withdrawal of the Soviet troops from Mongolia will be completed; use of Cam Ranh Bay in Vietnam by the Soviet Armed Forces is being reduced. We will lower the Soviet military presence in the Asian and Pacific Ocean region.

This process would proceed more quickly, if reciprocity were shown by other maritime powers. I believe that all this is being analyzed attentively and carefully here in Tokyo. I consider it necessary to stress that the Soviet Union is prepared to begin a concrete dialogue with Japan on military problems. This could remove mutual anxiety, and proposals have already been passed to your government. I think it would be worth beginning trilateral Soviet-Japanese-U.S. consultations. We see their value in enhancing trust by way of concrete accords, while removing suspicion. The Soviet Union approaches all these difficult and delicate problems in a realistic way. We have no subversive intentions whatsoever in relation to the military-political structures that have come about in the region. But we proceed from the inevitability of there ultimately being evolution by which the relative importance of military aspects in international relations will fall.

Now, as to how Soviet-Japanese relations are viewed in the context of processes in the Asia-Pacific region. History ensured that the Soviet Union should be a huge Eurasian state unique in its particular features and its possibilities. Japan, with its scientific and technical, industrial, and financial potential, plays a leading role in the Asia-Pacific region. Without these two states, therefore, it would be impossible to imagine the dynamics of the world process across almost half the world. Our new understandings of the USSR's place in the Asia-Pacific region was set out at Vladivostok in 1986, and soon afterward at Krasnoyarsk: We invited all countries in the region to join a dialogue.

Since that time it has been possible to extend and raise to a new level our relations with countries with whom such relations already existed, and to engage in and advance relations with many other countries in the region. Soviet-Chinese relations have been fully normalized and are improving. The Soviet Union and China were the first in Asia to implement practical steps for the mutual reduction of armed forces and confidence measures on the border. Relations with India have been developed further on the sound foundation of solidarity and friendship. There is much that is new and promising from contacts with Indonesia and other ASEAN countries. Diplomatic relations have been established and economic links have taken off rapidly with the Republic of Korea.

Appreciable progress has been achieved in the Soviet-Canadian dialogue, and favorable changes are evident in relations with Australia and also with New Zealand. The new nature of Soviet-U.S. relations—the global significance of which I spoke of earlier—has made it possible, in particular, to open up channels for vibrant links between the Soviet Far East, Chukotka, Kamchatka, Sakhalin, and Alaska and the western coast of the United States.

If the policy of the new thinking has yielded such favorable changes not only in relations with the United States and Europe but also in Asia and the Pacific, what

reason is there for abandoning it? Without it, we would not receive a real strengthening for our security in its contemporary understanding. Not to mention that it has enabled us to begin dismantling the ruinous burden of military expenditure. All of that is as far as the objective foundation of our new international course is concerned. I don't know of any serious political forces in my country that might advocate a return to the old approaches in foreign policy.

We perceive with satisfaction the progress in relations between Japan and China, Vietnam, the Republic of Korea, and the countries of ASEAN. We would consider the establishment of diplomatic relations by Japan with the DPRK as natural, and corresponding to the behest of the times. We view with understanding Japan's aspiration to play an active role in a Cambodian settlement. I take the opportunity of expressing our support for the work of the UN Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. At a recent session in Seoul the delegations of 48 states and 70 international organizations put forward the task—making use of the end of the Cold War—of converting the Asia-Pacific region into a zone of openness, cooperation, and prosperity.

Is this not a sign of changes? There is, in the countries of the region, where half the planet's population is concentrated, a multitude of the most complex problems awaiting resolution; economic, ethnic, social, religious, and ecological. No one can solve them on his own. What is needed is both a pooling of efforts and the freeing of material resources, which are still being squandered on armaments. An understanding of this is also gaining ground in the countries of the Asia-Pacific region. This is also borne out by the invigoration of bilateral ties in recent years. This is an inevitable and positive stage in the process that, we think, will lead to the multilateral examination of the problems not only of the economy but also of security because the one is everywhere more and more linked with the other.

We are not talking about some kind of machinery for multilateral cooperation, about institutionalization of the process. We are talking about consultations, about jointly bringing out and discussing common problems, about forestalling common dangers in a modern way. It is in precisely this sense that we are talking about the advisability of, for a start, a five-sided conference comprising the USSR, the United States, the PRC, India, and Japan. We invest our proposal concerning holding a meeting of the foreign ministers of all countries in the Asia-Pacific region in 1993 with precisely this consultative sense.

The time has come to put in practice the idea of creating a cooperation zone in the Sea of Japan basin. This could be a good laboratory for the economic integration of the Asia-Pacific region. We have an interest in abutting the economy of the Far East and Siberia onto the economic complex taking shape in the Asia-Pacific region. Of course, we are taking account of the difficulties, but we

can also see the huge potential. We have specific proposals on this matter. I outlined them today at my meeting with representatives of Japanese business circles. That is, overall, the context of Soviet-Japanese relations, their international and regional backgrounds. I repeat, however, they are still not commensurate even with existing potential.

The reason is to be found in the past. The burden of the past continues to be a millstone as far as our relations are concerned. We discussed all this in detail and frankly with Prime Minister Kaifu. I will not go into details, especially as we are still to continue our meeting with Mr. Kaifu—just a few of us—but I will share with you the ideas I am guided by.

There was much between our countries that left behind a bitter imprint in the hearts and memories of both peoples. What, then, is one to do here? One can cultivate the past and nurture mutual grievances, but it is a fruitless business. Another path must be chosen and the common past must be reevaluated for the sake of the present and the future.

World War II broke out and was waged in an altogether different world that has itself become a thing of the past, together with its ideas, laws, and rules of play—such is history. The decisions that were made then were made by people belonging to different generations and of different views, and we cannot be responsible for them. One must not, however, be unaware when putting right what they did, and one must not disregard the obvious fact that after them new realities came into being over a period of decades, realities one cannot but take into account.

Let us do everything to ensure that the memory of the past does not push peoples apart today, but instead prompts them to build relations on healthy and rational foundations, relevant to the present day. I think that today, half a century after that most monstrous of wars, the memory of its victims and of all the tragedies it caused, both in the West and the East, should remind us that nothing like it should ever be permitted again.

We cannot do much for those who are no longer with us. We can only, and we must, preserve their memory. The Soviet people are grateful to the Japanese for their caring treatment of the graves of Russian soldiers on Japanese soil. I assure you, people of Japan, that attention just as great and considerate will be paid to the graves of Japanese on our soil, too.

It is the task of historians to investigate thoroughly the causes of the war and its consequences and to weigh up the share of the blame of those who began it. It is the task of politicians, on the other hand, to ensure that the countries that fought then as part of different coalitions should never again regard each other within the categories of enemy, victor, and vanquished.

It is totally abnormal that between the USSR and Japan there is still no peace treaty that would draw a legal line

beneath World War II. We have to begin moving in this direction without excluding anything positive that has been built up during bilateral talks during different years—I stress—during different years. The main thing, however, is to augment the potential of trust by developing all-encompassing economic, political, and humanitarian cooperation, on statewide and regional levels, with republics—first and foremost with the Russian Federation, the biggest one, which has longstanding and direct ties with Japan as well as a shared border—cooperation between enterprises and firms, in tourist and other free contacts between people. Having taken all this into account, I am holding talks with the Japanese prime minister, and I think that their results and the more than 10 joint documents that are to be signed will show that Moscow and Tokyo are taking resolute steps toward going over to a full mutual understanding between our countries and finally settling the problems left us by the war, including the most difficult one, concerning territorial demarcation.

Now about my own country. You are probably waiting for my views on this subject. Exactly six years have passed since perestroika began. What succeeded and what failed during that period? The first two to three years were spent on realizing the situation in which the country had found itself, on what world surrounds it, and on working out the policy of perestroika. Subsequently, there began an ever faster destruction of the administrative and command system, an essentially totalitarian system. The new democratic system and way of life are taking shape in torment and, at times, in frenzied struggle. The unprecedented freedom, glasnost, the pluralism of parties, movements, and views are the characteristic features of our life.

We have begun to change ownership relations, started the transition to a mixed market economy, and are on the threshold of cardinal changes in the very nature of the Union as a federation of sovereign states. To be more brief, we are moving toward a new society, but it is a very painful process. Such fundamental and essentially revolutionary changes taking place in such a vast and multifaceted country, overburdened with problems, and with an abnormal economy and dogmatized social psychology could not, of course, have gone smoothly.

It has proved impossible for us to avoid a crisis patch, a most difficult transition from one condition to the other. The transformations have had a painful effect on the fundamental interests of various strata and of the whole people. Disputes about what is happening to us and what we have gotten ourselves into are raging everywhere—in families and work collectives, at rallies, on public transport, in lines, at learned conferences, and in the legislatures, not to mention the mass media.

A keen political struggle has developed in which, given our level of democratic sophistication, for many, all methods are acceptable. All this is against the background of the decline and disruption in our national economy. Hence the increase of instability in society. In

a word, the situation in the country is difficult, even dramatic. Many, including some of you in Japan, are concerned that perestroika may have come to a halt, that a backward movement may have begun. I believe that the changes that have taken place in the country are irreversible. Society has already changed and no one can turn it back.

Problems can be resolved only by moving forward. The crisis can be overcome only through concrete deeds and in the presence of accord concerning the main issues of the day. The salvation of perestroika now lies in dealing urgently and effectively with burning socioeconomic tasks to combat the crisis. That is precisely the essence and the aim of the specific anticrisis program drawn up on the eve of my visit to Japan. The program is calculated for a year and is set out literally month by month. I have no doubt that its strict and coordinated implementation will make it possible even this year to stabilize the situation and open new opportunities for progress. The course, the general policy toward radical economic reform and toward reformation of the Union, of the political system, and toward the creation of a law-governed state—we are not changing and have no intention of changing this policy.

I am confident that this line will enable us to attain the optimum correlation between stabilization of the situation and the creation of conditions for moving toward the market economy, for the structures of a law-based state to operate, and for the problems of a huge multi-ethnic state to be resolved. We will give every assistance to enterprise and support business initiative, we will help medium-sized and small businesses and the services sphere to progress, but we cannot allow ourselves to cast everything into the embraces of the market at a stroke. We intend to act with circumspection. At the moment we are bringing prices into line with the economic realities. This is a most difficult and painful operation.

The convertibility of the ruble is a most complex element in the transition to a market economy. Evidently, we now need to move toward this more quickly. This is necessary for the domestic market and is especially important for cooperation with other countries.

All this creates an objective basis for profound democratic transformation of our society. But the one will not fit with the other—the market economy with democracy—of their own accord. The efforts of political forces are needed and mutual understanding between them is needed—a minimum of essential accord. People must realize that if they sit in the same boat, they must row in the same direction.

At the moment, we have dangerous extremes and adventurism. The centrist political line that I stand for is an orientation toward responsibility striving for the new. Unless this line is sustained and unless democratic currents are consolidated around it a serious civil conflict could ensue. Unless we halt the disintegration of the

state, the economy, the law, mutual ties between republics, and unless we retain within peaceful limits the new social processes, the country may, indeed, find itself in the chaos from which dictatorships are born.

For those reasons we are also having to take unpopular steps, within the framework of the constitution, including steps of an administrative order. These are assessed by many, including people abroad, as a change of course. But that is a mistaken conclusion. Everything we are undertaking at the moment is necessary precisely to preserve the course of perestroika and at the same time to create the prerequisites for its more decisive progress. And decisiveness is needed; it is needed to help the emergence—while displaying restraint and patience and not giving in to pressure either from the right or the left—of a new political culture, one that recognizes pluralism, competitiveness between political programs, and debate, while strictly observing the laws and a law-based system. Firm authority is needed for the normal functioning of a democracy, authority that draws on the law.

Ladies and gentlemen! You will evidently agree that perestroika has proved to be a problem that is not a national one of ours alone. It is a world problem, as well. What happens in a country such as the Soviet Union cannot fail to be reflected in world processes.

Following the 17 March referendum, in which the question was asked whether or not there should be a Soviet Union, we can say with certainty: Our state will remain great and preserve its role and responsibility in world affairs. The referendum also expressed the attitude of the majority of the population in regard to the country's position in the world structure. Those who decide to leave as a result of lawful referendums in the republics should recognize the need for the constitutional process, which will make it possible to guarantee the interests of all those who will inevitably be affected by such a dramatic rupture.

The possibility of creating a new and peaceful world order depends in great measure upon the outcome of perestroika. It is therefore extremely important that our problems are correctly understood in the world community, and above all by those who have the opportunity to exert great influence upon the main vector of world politics. We are counting on backing for our efforts, especially now, during this acute phase of the transitional period.

Perestroika and the policy of the new thinking will enable us to return the country to the process of general civilization, to the world economy, and the international division of labor. The country has already turned its face toward the outside world; many friends and partners have emerged; an atmosphere of solidarity with us has arisen.

We will make use of the experience of other countries that have gone through the critical stage of modernization before us and have achieved success. This does not,

however, mean renouncing our own identity. For us it is clear: Only by taking account of the specific historical and sociopsychological particularities of our country and its people, only by learning to rely upon these in conditions of equality and interaction will we be able to preserve the integrity of our multiethnic society. Blind copying or attempts to treat our own sickness using prescriptions designed for other conditions would most likely yield damaging and even catastrophic results.

For our country, too, has managed to get across the dangerous reefs of modernization and reach the foremost frontiers of technical progress, thanks to the fact that while borrowing the experience of others, it has preserved its own national traditions and has responded to the challenge of the outside world without submitting to it. And it has been able to defend its own cultural and spiritual uniqueness.

Esteemed legislators. Concluding my speech, I wish to take a brief glance into the future. Winston Churchill once said: Statesmen differ from politicians in that the former think about the future, whereas the latter think about the next elections. Alas, we all too often imitate such politicians.

We live in a time, however, when those who bear responsibility for the destiny of their own countries and peoples are obliged constantly to keep in view the problems upon which the destiny of mankind depends.

Life on earth is in danger. We first understood this in connection with the threat of nuclear war. Now we have managed to put this aside. But mankind now finds itself face to face with other terrible dangers, above all the ecological danger.

Scientists warn that if nothing is done in the coming decades there will be irreversible changes in the planet's climate throughout the ecosystem. This would be equivalent to a prolonged nuclear catastrophe. We will take that into account. Nature is giving us an unambiguous sign: It is time to put an end to the arms race, reckless conflicts, and the senseless waste of resources, and to increasingly switch our energy, will, and talents to saving man's environment and thus life on earth itself.

For centuries, countries and people have assessed each other in the categories of "ours" and "theirs", and followed rules of conduct where some people winning necessarily meant others losing. Whatever the justifications for this philosophy, we ourselves and our antecedents paid dearly for it. It is a reality that the fates of humankind today are one. This gives responsible politicians a different scale of thinking—that of all humankind.

The world is set up in such a way that the rich and the poor will coexist for a long time yet. But let us not forget—it is not easy for a nation that has been cornered and has lost its historical perspective to accept the values of all humankind. Feeling trapped and in despair presents a serious threat to the progress of civilization.

Therefore, countries that are moving forward and helping others are helping themselves.

Naturally, particular responsibility lies with the great powers and their leaders. We see the prospects for Soviet-Japanese cooperation on global problems, of course, in interaction with the United States and other powers of North and South, on this level. This specifically presupposes the enhancement of the role of the United Nations, refining the entire system of international institutions, and raising them to the level of the tasks of the 21st century.

No one can guarantee us success in advance. The only guarantee can be wise policy, foreseeing danger, being able to move to head such danger off, and being prepared for dialogue and compromise.

Together let us seek out answers to the challenge of the times and together make hope for the future that unites us in reality.

Addressing his Japanese colleague, the writer Tokutomi Roka, Lev Nikolayevich Tolstoy said: You ask about the ways of establishing lasting friendship between Russia and Japan. This is essential. Only if we are moving toward the same aim, united by one aspiration, can we achieve that aim.

May these words serve as a guiding star, pointing out the way that will take our people to a real meeting with each other. Thank you.

Gorbachev, Kaifu Exchange Toasts at Dinner

*LD1704154691 Moscow TASS in English 1528 GMT
17 Apr 91*

[by TASS special correspondent]

[Text] Tokyo April 17 TASS—A state dinner on behalf of Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu and Empress Michiko was given tonight for Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and his wife Raisa.

Kaifu and Gorbachev exchanged speeches at the dinner.

Kaifu Toast

*PM1804142791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Apr 91 Second Edition p 5*

[TASS report on speech delivered by Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu at 17 April banquet for M.S. Gorbachev in Tokyo: "Dinner in USSR President's Honor; Speech by T. Kaifu"]

[Text] Your Excellency Mr. President Gorbachev, Mrs. Gorbacheva, and other guests!

I am happy to have this opportunity to meet with you, Your Excellency Mr. President, and to hold this reception in your honor. Your visit to Japan, insofar as I am aware, is the first-ever visit to our country in the history of Japanese-Soviet relations by the top leader of the

USSR, and this evokes particularly profound feelings both in me personally and in the entire Japanese people. I wholeheartedly welcome you, Mr. President, your wife, and all the officials accompanying you, to our country.

Your Excellency Mr. President!

The 20th century, which has one decade left to run, has been an epoch-making century in the history of all mankind. Having come through the trials of two tragic world wars, and then having overcome the "cold war," mankind has, it seems, finally started to realize that it is a community on a global scale. And, in the context of this general trend, recent years have witnessed waves of rapid change around the world which are particularly noteworthy even amid the turbulent events of the 20th century. There can be no doubt that even future historians will perceive these changes as an immense watershed of the kind which occurs only once every few centuries.

It is precisely at this period that the most major turning point in relations between our countries is taking place, and this can be said to be an historical necessity. The fundamental improvement in Japanese-Soviet relations which both states are making joint efforts to bring about, and which must be brought about, is a task not just for our two countries. It is a task whose resolution will require efforts by all nearby [blizhniye] and neighboring countries in the Asia-Pacific region and in the world as a whole. In this sense Mr. President's current visit to Japan is, I believe, an event which could mark the beginning of a new era, both in the light of the history of Japanese-Soviet relations, and from the standpoint of current world politics.

Your Excellency Mr. President!

The diplomacy of new thinking, which you have been pursuing in your country over the past few years, cannot be viewed in isolation from the waves of historic changes. It is against the backdrop of these changes that you have been making your efforts to carry out unprecedented, massive transformations in your country and to pursue perestroika, which has now become a word common to all countries. Now that such values as democracy, individual freedom, and supremacy of the law are becoming universal, the superiority of democracy in the human community will become unshakable if your country starts taking firm steps to protect these universal values. The hope that a genuine world order based on international peace, security, and justice will clearly become a reality, too. In this sense I believe that, among the values reaffirmed in the course of perestroika, recognition of the priority of common human values is of the most epoch-making importance.

The great poet Boris Pasternak, who not only was the quintessential soul of your people but also left behind an immortal legacy for all mankind, wrote in "Doctor Zhivago" that "throughout the entire postwar period a presentiment of freedom constantly hung in the air." The novel ends with a picture depicting how a "freedom

of spirit had already come to the sacred city of Moscow, and the city was swathed in delightful tranquility at the joy of entering the future." With his poet's sensitivity, he had foreseen the breath of freedom which is now gradually being reborn. These are truly impressive words.

Our country wholeheartedly hopes that you and your lofty ideals will continue to pursue the course of transformations and meet with success. On the basis of this view, our country intends, as far as possible, to promote the transformations in your country from the technical standpoint. I sincerely hope that the numerous agreements which it is proposed to sign in connection with the current visit will, through joint efforts, help to maintain the relations of cooperation between our two countries and promote the implementation of the course of transformation in your country.

Your Excellency Mr. President!

Quite frankly, the historical road which our countries have traveled was by no means smooth. It is no exaggeration to say that it was a rocky road which brought pain to both countries' peoples. But, at the same time, the events which occurred in relations between us apply not only to relations between Japan and the USSR. These are events which have recurred innumerable times in human history. But it is also a fact that mankind, displaying the utmost courage and reason, has overcome this difficult road. We are striving for rapid development in bilateral relations.

Your Excellency Mr. President!

To our sincere regret, your current visit to our country is a brief one but, nonetheless, I wholeheartedly hope that it will be pleasant and leave a deep impression on you and your wife. I sincerely hope that you will make use of this visit to familiarize yourselves with the situation in our country and, above all, to gain an insight into the Japanese soul.

Allow me to propose a toast to the health of His Excellency Mr. President Gorbachev and his wife, to the prosperity of the Soviet Union, and to the sure success of the joint efforts of Japan and the USSR.

Gorbachev Toast

CM1804134991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
18 Apr 91 Second Edition p 5

[TASS report on speech delivered by President Mikhail Gorbachev at 17 April banquet hosted by Japanese Prime Minister Toshiki Kaifu in Tokyo: "Dinner in USSR President's Honor; Speech by M.S. Gorbachev"]

[Text] Esteemed Mr. Prime Minister, esteemed Mrs. Kaifu, ladies and gentlemen, comrades!

I cannot fail to begin my sincere gratitude for the cordiality and hospitality which we have been constantly feeling over these past few days. We see in this a

manifestation of good feelings toward our country and respect for the Soviet people.

We came to Japan with the firm wish for a radical improvement of relations and the intention to seek better mutual understanding, to work for the drawing together of our peoples and to broaden the range of trust, and at the same time to promote the development of Soviet-Japanese interaction as an international factor and as an important component of world politics.

In this respect personal relations between statesmen have considerable importance. In recent years the personal factor has become a characteristic feature of international activity. In the person of Mr. Kaifu, I have found a partner with whom it is possible to speak about the essence of the matter forthrightly and without diplomatic circumlocution and vagueness. This indeed gives the dialogue the necessary energy of trust. I hope that in Moscow, too, we shall continue the dialogue that has been successfully begun with the Japanese prime minister in Tokyo.

We do have something to depend on in the organization of fresh relations. Our peoples will not be found lacking in goodwill. Indeed, I see it as the task of politicians and diplomats to allow the natural sense of good-neighborliness to fully manifest itself.

By promoting the creation of a climate of confidence and building up the potential for contacts and cooperation, we will gradually find solutions to any problems.

The talks with the Japanese leadership have shown how much can be achieved by meeting each other halfway. We do not close our eyes to our differences but, as the Japanese proverb says, if you discuss your disputes while in a rowboat you will find a common language. By directing this rowboat toward a cherished goal, we can leave behind the disputes which are not worth taking with us into the 21st century.

I am very pleased that Mr. Kaifu and I are striving to examine Soviet-Japanese relations in the context of the world's growing integrity and the mutual dependence of states. This also increases responsibility for ensuring that our relations fulfill their international function in a worthy manner. After all, the durability and stability of the new world order, toward which the world has moved, are directly proportional to the reliability of the world's components—that is, bilateral ties, especially when this concerns major, influential countries.

So the place and role of the Soviet Union and Japan in the present-day world objectively and urgently demand a different quality in relations and interaction.

It was precisely from this point of view that I proceeded when I telephoned Mr. Kaifu at the most acute moment of the crisis and war in the Gulf. This crisis became a fundamental test of the world community's ability to tackle problems in a new way and according to the criterion of establishing a peaceful future in the history

of humanity. Mutual understanding between the Soviet Union and Japan at such a time, and in connection with such an event, reaffirms that great possibilities for Soviet-Japanese cooperation in the international arena do exist.

We are ready for a constructive dialogue and interaction with Japan on a wide range of issues and, naturally, on problems of the Asian-Pacific region.

I shall not take issue with or join those who wish to finally decide whether the 21st century will be the century of the Pacific Ocean. Whatever the case, even now everyone senses the growing effect of the Asian-Pacific region's developments on the world economy and politics. It is clear to everyone that a new world order is impossible without the independent, original, and authoritative participation and contribution of the countries of Asia and the Pacific Ocean basin.

The ending of the cold war has brought to life many major, promising ideas. One of them, which was discussed at the all-European summit meeting in Paris, is the formation of a single belt of cooperation in the northern hemisphere. It is not a question of Europe and America imposing their order on other countries situated in this hemisphere. It is simply that they are starting from their end.

The Soviet Union, a Eurasian power whose territory stretches over almost half of this belt, would naturally occupy a substantial place in it. But we do not—nor do others, I am sure—think of this geopolitical space of cooperation and new ties between states and nations without the participation of Japan, without, in particular, healthy and full-blooded Soviet-Japanese relations.

In appealing to those present, I appeal to the Japanese people, a great nation and our close neighbor, with hope and faith in our joint future. The Soviet Union is ready to go half-way to meet its Far Eastern neighbor, sincerely desiring good-neighborliness and equitable partnership.

To the health of the prime minister and his wife!
To the prosperity of the Japanese people!

To understanding and good relations between the USSR and Japan!

PRAVDA Reviews Gorbachev's 17 Apr Meetings

PM1804135191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian

18 Apr 91 Second Edition pp 1, 5

[Special correspondents T. Kolesnichenko and I. Latyshev report: "Japan: Day Two"]

[Text] Tokyo 17 Apr—"What are you looking for from Japanese businessmen?", M.S. Gorbachev was asked by a local journalist when the Soviet president was entering the New Otani Hotel, where he was awaited by more than 600 representatives of the Land of the Rising Sun's business circles. "Probably the same thing they expect from us," was the reply.

Present in a large room at the New Otani were the heads of several world-famous firms—Mitsubishi, Mitsui, Sumitomo, Sony, Marubeni, Nissho Iwai, and others—whose financial operations are calculated in billions of dollars.

In his speech M.S. Gorbachev outlined the extensive prospects for the development of Soviet-Japanese trade and economic relations.

In general, neighboring countries cannot fail to have mutual economic interests. Timber, oil, fish, the environment, fundamental science—all these can and should be included in the mutually advantageous trade and economic sphere of cooperation.

As for us, the theory and practice of this country's management is of particular interest to us. After all, it is no secret that labor productivity in Japanese companies is higher than in corresponding firms in the United States, Britain, Germany, or other developed countries. Not for nothing were the Americans happy to sell the Japanese that New York landmark—the Rockefeller Center.

In general, it would be better to take a good look at the actual structure of the Japanese economic model. It is far closer to us than the chaotic market in other states, since it successfully combines a state sector with entrepreneurial activity.

To be fair, we should note that a great deal depends on us too. The Japanese businessmen with whom we spoke all referred to the constant lack of organization in our foreign economic departments. Whom should they approach for licenses? Whom should they ask to repay loans? With whom, finally, should they negotiate simply to get a definite yes or no? For example, the project to jointly develop oil and gas extraction on the Sakhalin Shelf has been "in the offing" for... 15 years now. The Japanese side has made specific proposals, while our side has produced "evasive answers." Hisao Kanamori, director of the USSR Institute in Japan, believes that all this disorganization is the main obstacle to Japanese penetration of our markets.

However, there has been considerable progress. It is especially evident in Hokkaido and Niigata Prefectures, where 60 private companies—including banks and local government offices—have now set up the first Japanese financial corporation specializing in projects connected with the USSR. Its startup capital is 1.5 billion yen. Now, for example, Japanese businessmen who want to establish joint ventures with us can obtain the credit they need. An exhibition by "Dalintorg" and the Soviet Far East Trade Corporation was recently held with success in Niigata. Some 150 firms took part in it on the Japanese side. Deals worth \$13.5 million were done. Of course, this is just the beginning, but it is important that Japanese businessmen—many of them, at any rate—are no longer waiting for us to sell or cede them the islands. Territory is not on sale, but products are. And people here are starting to realize this.

We would particularly like to note the humanitarian factor, which is more and more clearly visible in our relations. After all, Hiroshima and Chernobyl were both tragedies, however different their situations. We visited Japanese financier Y. Sasakawa. He said that implementation of a program worth more than \$40 million to help the suffering children of Chernobyl, Belorussia, the Ukraine, and Russia had been specially prepared to coincide with our president's visit. Unlike our NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA [Independent Newspaper], people here know how much attention M.S. Gorbachev—who has twice visited Chernobyl—devotes to this problem.

M.S. Gorbachev's speech in the Japanese legislature today was an event of exceptional political importance. Becoming a member of the legislative organ is the cherished goal of the overwhelming majority of Japanese politicians and public figures, irrespective of their party affiliations, because this post guarantees high public status for all of them. All deputies here are called "sensei"—teacher. Virtually all the sensei attended the joint session of both houses of the legislature this time.

The USSR president's speech was carried by the four central television channels. Commentators emphasized its peace-loving thrust, as well as the Soviet leader's sincere desire to specifically improve Soviet-Japanese relations. At the special news conference held at the legislature immediately after the USSR president's speech, the same assessments were made of it by major figures on the country's political scene—Takako Doi, chairman of the Social Democratic Party Central Executive Committee; former Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone, and Michio Watanabe, a prominent leader of the ruling Liberal Democratic Party.

It is already clear that the ideas expressed by M.S. Gorbachev in the Japanese legislature have given new impetus to the discussion of a whole series of urgent problems of international relations in the Asia-Pacific region.

Dozens of hands stretched out in welcome toward M.S. Gorbachev as he walked through one of the rooms in Tokyo's New Otani Hotel, where the Soviet leader today met with Japanese university students and their professors. Around 300 students and teachers from six major Japanese universities—Waseda, Tokai, Keio, Soka, Ritsumeikan, and the Tokyo Foreign Language Institute—attended the meeting with the USSR president.

The new relations with Japan which we seek and which are the reason for my visit to your country include not just politics, economics, and security, M.S. Gorbachev said at the meeting.

Sakhalin Representative Departs Prematurely LD1704142591

[Editorial Report] Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian at 1230 GMT on 17 April broadcasts a 7-minute live telephone report from Tokyo by political observer

Vladimir Tsvetov on Gorbachev's talks with Kaifu, noting that they dealt with five topics: East-West relations, the Middle East situation, the development of the situation in the Asia-Pacific region, the situation on the Korean Peninsula, and a settlement in Cambodia. Tsvetov notes that Ignatenko told journalists that a thorough dialogue was under way that would influence not only Soviet-Japanese relations but also East-West relations as a whole.

Tsvetov mentions Kaifu's concern about the political and economic situation in the USSR and adds: "Gorbachev told the Japanese prime minister that the victory of perestroika in the USSR is important for the whole world. Gorbachev explained why: the resources which Japan invested in the victory of perestroika would free it, as well as the other developed countries, of investing even greater resources in military preparations. So, the economic advantages of assisting perestroika are evident." Tsvetov also recalls Gorbachev's remark yesterday in his Tokyo Television interview to the effect that we will remember those who helped us at a difficult time and who refused to give help. Tsvetov adds: "As you can see, the Soviet side's thought is essentially correct, but I cannot rid myself of the feeling that there is in these remarks an element of arm-twisting in the talks. However, as you know, politics are guided by interests and not feelings".

Tsvetov notes Gorbachev's high assessment of President Bush: "Bush, in Gorbachev's view, is distinguished by a high level of reliability, wide scope of thought, and a principled attitude and firmness with regard to outside pressure. It would be nice if Bush would assess just as highly some of our politicians".

He notes that the measures to reduce the Soviet military presence in the Asian and Pacific region made during today's talks may not be acceptable to the Japanese, as nothing was said about reducing military activity in the Kuriles, but they do represent a first step. Gorbachev is expected to make his stand on the territorial question clear tomorrow.

Tsvetov continues: "Moreover, I am forced to refrain from commenting today by the sudden departure from Tokyo of Fedorov, chairman of the Sakhalin Oblast Executive Committee. At the airport, he told Japanese correspondents that his position as a person accompanying the USSR president had not met his expectations and that during the top level talks, the interests of the population of Sakhalin were not being taken into account. Fedorov declined to explain in more detail the reasons for his refusal to participate in the president's visit to Japan".

Tsvetov notes Ignatenko's remarks to the effect that "since the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Extraordinary Congress of People's Deputies, Yeltsin has occupied a more constructive and more patriotic stand on a number of vital political and economic problems, and Yeltsin's speech in Strasbourg testifies to

this." He concludes his report by saying that this afternoon, Kaifu and Gorbachev had a 2-hour one-to-one discussion on territorial demarcation, deciding to continue it tomorrow at a fourth, unplanned meeting.

Muscovites Polled on Gorbachev's Japan Visit 91P50162A

[Editorial Report] Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 15 of 17 April 1991 publishes on page 1 an unattributed item entitled "Moscow: Waiting, But Not Believing Very Much," which appears under the heading "Prognosis on the Soviet President's Visit." The item states that a "sociological service" named "Opinion" polled Muscovites on the following question: "Will M. Gorbachev's talks in Tokyo help us cope with our economic difficulties?" The results were as follows: "Yes"—19.9 percent; "No"—42.8 percent; "Yes and no"—11.3 percent; "I don't know"—24.7 percent; "First time I've heard about this"—1.3 percent.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

U.S. Philippines Bases Not Among Those Closing HK1904094591 Moscow in Tagalog to the Philippines 1300 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Subic Naval Base and Clark Air Base are not included in the Pentagon list which names the military facilities to be dismantled. This was announced by the spokesman of the United States Embassy in Manila in connection with the shutting down of 198 U.S. military facilities overseas and 31 armed forces' military bases within a five-year period.

A delegation from Washington is scheduled to arrive in Manila to sign an agreement extending the validity of the American military facilities in the Philippines.

Meanwhile, leading those opposing this move is Senate minority floor leader Senator Juan Ponce Enrile, who states that the military bases should go. Enrile, along with 10 other senators, is opposed to the ratification of a new agreement between Manila and Washington allowing the bases to stay on.

Near East & South Asia

Khowst Fall Indicates Mujahidin 'Consolidation' PM1804144791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 13 Apr 91 First Edition p 2

[Lieutenant Colonel A. Oliynik report: "Why Khowst Fell: Our Special Correspondent Reports From Afghanistan"]

[Text] During all the years of war in Afghanistan the armed opposition was characterized by disunity.

Interneine strife, which frequently turned into protracted fighting in which heavy armaments were used, alternately died down for a time and then flared up again with renewed force.

However, at the beginning of the year, it seemed, the mujahidin opposed the Najibullah regime if not as a united front then having at least come to agreements of some sort. The proof of this was the seizure of Khowst, which was defended by a garrison of 10,000 men with a defensive ring layered in depth. The garrison had tanks, artillery, and air cover available to it.

Today in Kabul certain circles are inclined to believe that the basic reason for the fall of Khowst was a massive mujahidin attack from four directions at once with Pakistani artillery support and, for the first time, the use of tanks to puncture the defense in a narrow area. Some people also believe allegations that things would not have turned out as they did without treachery... And nevertheless the main reason, which is now understood by an increasing number of officials in Kabul, is that on this occasion the rebels were acting together as they have never done before, in accordance with a single plan and under the general leadership of J. Haqqani.

How did the opposition manage to consolidate itself? Over the past year its sponsors from the U.S. special services and Pakistani military circles have striven in every way to rally the Afghan opposition. R. Oakley, the U.S. ambassador to Pakistan, and high-ranking Pakistani military personnel headed by Major General Durani, the chief of military intelligence, have had a hand in the campaign. According to the BAKHTAR agency, they have participated in a series of talks that have taken place with the "seven" [reference to seven leading mujahidin groups based at Peshawar], where it was strongly recommended that a halt be called to the feuding between the various groups and field commanders.

At the same time, Pakistani newspapers reported that Washington's special envoy P. Tomsen also held a series of meetings with leaders of the leading parties and field commanders, and talked several times with the head of the so-called Mojaddedi provisional government. As a result, a conference of leading field commanders was held in Peshawar. At this conference an all-Afghan council of field commanders was set up, the main task of which is to establish a united fighting front against President Najibullah and to coordinate joint operations over the period of the entire 1991 spring and summer campaign. In order to put this plan into practice, a number of committees and directorates were formed (military, political, security) on a compromise basis.

As a certain M. Anwar, one of the field commanders, acknowledged, it was at this sitting of the all-Afghan council of field commanders that the campaign to seize Khowst was drawn up and operations precisely coordinated among the 50 or so detachments which stormed the city and whose ranks numbered 15,000 men.

Of course, this statement may be assessed in different ways. These days, for example, both the Republic of Afghanistan's mass media and broadcasts by foreign radio voices continue to assert the persistent idea that the unification of the mujahidin is temporary and has come about exclusively in order to demonstrate one more time to the West, and most of all to the United States and a number of Arab states, that the opposition is still a real force and therefore needs considerably more financial help than it is getting at present. Newspapers, radio, and television carry daily reports about numerous combats between mujahidin groups. And indeed skirmishes are indeed continuing in the opposition camp, as confirmed by the Afghan Ministry of Internal Affairs. But nevertheless today one can see consolidation in the mujahidin ranks, and many differences that existed between armed detachments of Sunnis and Shiites who belonged to different parties have been eliminated.

General on Efforts To Free POW's in Afghanistan

*LD1804115491 Moscow TASS in English 1131 GMT
18 Apr 91*

[By TASS correspondent Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—"The Soviet Union will step up its efforts to find and bring home the servicemen taken prisoner in Afghanistan," Lieutenant-General Leonid Ivashov, chief of the Executive Department of the USSR Defence Ministry, told TASS today after a working visit to Switzerland at the invitation of the International Red Cross Committee.

Representatives of the committee noted that the Defence Ministry makes a considerable contribution to the implementation of the USSR's obligations under international law. He said that chiefs of the International Red Cross Committee expressed satisfaction with the relationship between the USSR armed forces, the International Red Cross Committee and the International Institute of Humanitarian Law.

Ivashov said that when the Gulf war was discussed, it was emphasised that the United States has given serious attention to the observance of the Geneva conventions.

It was noted that there were no cases of looting, marauding and violence against prisoners of war and civilians by U.S. servicemen and servicemen of the multinational forces.

"Being aware of the need to intensify the effort to establish the whereabouts of Soviet servicemen taken prisoner in Afghanistan, the leadership of the International Red Cross Committee pointed to the importance of permanent contacts with representatives of various Soviet organisations searching for Soviet servicemen," Ivashov said.

PRAVDA on Safe Havens, Iraqi Kurds' Plight

*PM1804145591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4*

[Correspondent An. Stepanov report under the rubric "Two Sides of the Kurdish Problem": "Is There a Way Out of the Impasse?"]

[Text] Baghdad-Moscow—"A great human tragedy"—this is how leading news media assess what is happening in Kurdish-populated regions in the north of Iraq.

Crazed by hunger, cold, and disease, crowds of Kurdish refugees fleeing from persecution by the Baghdad regime have taken refuge in the mountains on the borders with Iran, Turkey, and Syria. Representatives of the Red Cross and international charity organizations have familiarized themselves with the state of affairs on the spot and believe that, even if aid, which is in disastrously short supply, arrives in time and in sufficient quantities, it is practically impossible to save thousands of emaciated and frost-bitten people—primarily children, women, and old people.

What can alleviate the torment of the refugees who have left their homes out of fear for their life? The situation is complicated by the fact that the Kurdish problem is also an object of speculation and of a political game on the part of various local and foreign forces. Where is the way out of the impasse? What solutions are proposed?

From London, for example, calls are being made for special safe zones to be created for the Kurds in the north of Iraq under UN control. Turkey, for example, has already introduced its own military units into the north of Iraq for the purpose of "guaranteeing the safety of Kurdish refugees." Senators in Washington are demanding direct U.S. armed intervention.

Thus, the question arises willy-nilly, if not of dismembering Iraq, then at least of forming zones on its territory outside the central authority's jurisdiction. Naturally, all this is, strictly speaking, at variance with the norms of international law and represents interference in a sovereign state's internal affairs.

Arab journalists who have visited the north of the country have in turn told me that the leadership of the Kurdish uprising adopted a decision not to engage a final battle in major cities with the units of the Iraqi "Republican Guard" which are being transferred there but to go off into the mountains, taking with them as many as possible of the peaceful population. The ultimate aims of the Kurdish movement were formulated by M. Barzani, chairman of the Democratic Party of Kurdistan: to secure autonomy and the creation of a Kurdish state by means of dialogue after a transitional period. According to him, the autonomy granted to the Kurds by Baghdad in 1970 was a deception, and since 1975 the Baghdad regime has destroyed approximately 4,000 Kurdish villages.

What version of the tragic events does Baghdad advance? I will point out that it is a question not of justifying the Iraqi position but of putting it on record. According to Iraqi Deputy Prime Minister T. 'Aziz, the Iraqi Government has "simply restored order in the country's cities, as any other government would have done in its place." Iraqi Prime Minister S. Hammadi has declared that Iraq will struggle against the creation of enclaves for Kurds in the north of the country, which are incompatible with its sovereignty. Baghdad believes that only the lifting of economic sanctions against Iraq can cardinal resolve the problem of humanitarian aid for the Kurdish refugees.

But the situation is such that what is needed is not explanations or recriminations but a search for solutions. Mankind's conscience demands that an end be put to the drama in the mountains of Kurdistan and that thousands upon thousands of lives be saved. And this is just the first step. The next is to restore peace and security in the north of Iraq while observing the legitimate rights of the country's almost 4-million Kurdish population.

The foundation of such a settlement, with no external interference whatever, was laid in the past. A statement by the Iraqi Revolutionary Command Council as long ago as 11 March 1970 contained recognition of the Kurds' right to autonomy within the framework of the Iraqi state and permitted the activities of progressive Kurdish organizations. At that time the Kurdish language was recognized as the second official language, and a program for the economic development of Kurdistan was begun. Unfortunately, many of those provisions remained only on paper, mainly through the fault of Baghdad...

Kurdish-Iraqi Conflict in Kurdistan Viewed

*91UF0653A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian No 15, 17 Apr 91 p 4*

[Article by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA special correspondent St. Kraynev: "With Those Who Are About To Die—From Iraqi Kurdistan"]

[Text] Kurdistan-Damascus When the uprising of the Kurds broke out, our correspondent was able to get to Iraqi Kurdistan. Later, the uprising was brutally suppressed. About three million Kurds became refugees. This report is about how they lived under Saddam Husayn's rule.

After traveling 800 kilometers in a car and after reaching the most remote point of Syria to the northeast, with the help of Iraqi Communists, I crossed the muddy and swift waters of the Tigris by boat in an area where Syria, Turkey, and Iraq join.

We were brought to the town of Zakho.

"Owing to the victory of the allies and the isolation of Baghdad in the international arena, the detestable regime became weaker. The Kurdish partisans—

'peshmerga' (which means those who are about to die) have experience in armed struggle, gained over the decades, and there are enough captured weapons to topple several tyrants," I was told by Toma Tomas [as transliterated], a member of the Central Committee of the Iraqi Communist Party. "We are also glad that Soviet friends finally understand just who Saddam is."

There are victims of repression and terror in every Kurdish family: Some were tortured, and some died in torture chambers. In Kurdistan up until now, several dozens of thousands of persons are counted as missing. Four thousand villages were destroyed. There are mass burial places.

In the opinion of the Kurds, Saddam, however, has been most successful in the sphere of prisons. A local office of the security service is being erected in the center of every city. I saw several of them. I was shown walls in prison cells in the city of Zakho that were covered with the signatures of prisoners. There were hundreds of names and dates, words from prayers and poetry, and straight lines—the number of days spent behind bars. I recall one drawing: A woman sitting behind a table surrounded by children, and the empty chair of the man of the house.

"There are hundreds of such prisons in the country. I saw one of them near Karkuk," relates one of the residents of the city. "There were several hundred people there. When we entered, many of them were already dead. I was shaken most of all by the sight of four dead women who were hanged by the butchers by their breasts."

In the city of Dahuk, the Kurdish rebels showed a splendid building of the local security service with English lawns, flowers, chaise lounges, and splendid offices and libraries with foreign journals. Pathetic shepherd dog puppies were crawling around among papers strewn on the floor. The archives, where files were kept on thousands of residents of the city, made an impression on me. In basements, besides the weapons arsenal, I viewed the torture chambers and some kind of "work tools" of the executioners. I recall the inscription on the inside of a door of one of the cells: "My reader, I am writing these words while I am still living. When you read them, I will be under the ground..." I was told that for the shooting of a "rebel" the authorities collected 300 dinars from his relatives as payment for execution services and the expenditure of ammunition.

From Dahuk, we headed out to the east, to the mountains, to the health resort of Sarsank, where the summer residence of the Iraq leader and his associates is located. There were palaces there that were presented to him by the heads of other states—Jordan's King Husayn and the shaykhs of the emirates. Surrounded by flowers and gardens are super-modern luxurious villas and palaces, made of Italian building material, which blended strikingly harmoniously into the surrounding landscape: mountains, ponds, waterfalls. One of Husayn's palaces (it is said there are 40) is situated on the snow-capped top

of the Jarah Range. This summer residence resembled an elegant two-story castle in its architecture, and the spot—an eagle's nest. Up until now, no foreigner or local resident set foot here. Each of the 36 separate turns was protected by guards. The palace, covered with a green tile roof, had a colored slab with the monogram "S. Kh"—the initials of the owner. If it was difficult for the tired leader to climb the steps made of pink or gray marble to the second floor, there was a goldish elevator at his service. I saw another smaller elevator in the dining room. It was used to send meals from the basement where the kitchen was situated. Each of the rooms had a view through tinted glass of the sky, cliffs, and peaks covered with snow. From one of the balconies, I looked with admiration at the thrilling view of the gorge and the deep hollow. Not long ago a Kurdish village was situated at the bottom. It was leveled in order not to ruin the view.

In over-filled hospitals, I had occasion to see those with whom Saddam was fighting up until now—his own people. There were men on cots with awful burns from phosphorous and napalm bombs. They were unable to speak, but the miraculously spared eyes were more expressive than any words. I saw an old woman there and year-old children—they were also a target for bombs and shells.

In the main mosque of Zakho, there were several dozen people in military uniform. This is a small part of those hundred thousand Iraqi soldiers who did not fight against the Kurds.

"They treat us like guests and brothers. We were prisoners in the army, but we got freedom here. Saddam is the perpetrator of the war and of all of Iraq's misfortunes, and we ask all countries to help the Iraqi people to remove him."

I was unable to return to Syria at the scheduled time. The Iraqis were firing guns against the crossing area from an outpost not far off. I had to wait until evening. I saw the smiling face of a "peshmerga" in the light of an illuminating rocket that rose up from the Iraqi outpost.

East Europe

Official on Poland Troop Withdrawal Talks

PM1804155391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
16 Apr 91 Union Edition p 3

["From Authoritative Sources" interview with V. Kopteltsev, deputy chief of a USSR Foreign Ministry administration, by correspondent N. Burbyga: "When Are We Leaving Poland?"]

[Text] Round six of the talks between the USSR and the Polish Republic on the transit of Soviet troops from Germany and the withdrawal of the Northern Group of Forces from Poland has ended in Warsaw. Our correspondent talked about the results of the talks with Soviet

delegation head V. Kopteltsev, deputy chief of a USSR Foreign Ministry administration.

No final results were achieved at the talks. Therefore the next round will take place in Moscow in early May.

[Burbyga] Has the timetable for the withdrawal of Soviet troops from Poland been set?

[Kopteltsev] We have a difference of opinion on this question. The Polish side insists that the forces should be withdrawn in 1991. Of course, we cannot accept this. We said it should be by the end of 1994. However, in the course of the talks, in view of the Polish side's request, we agreed to withdraw the forces before the end of 1993.

[Burbyga] Is that realistic?

[Kopteltsev] We know it will be difficult. But the General Staff thinks we will cope.

[Burbyga] But rushing things like that will affect first and foremost the families of servicemen who do not have apartments in the Union...

[Kopteltsev] I have heard criticism of this kind before. But the diplomats are not guilty, since we do not tackle any question without the military. If you are going to take someone to task it has to be both ministries. It is time to stop pitting the Foreign Ministry against the military.

There are events that are difficult to predict. For example, many thought that the unification of Germany would take at least three years. The Germans themselves thought so. It is not the diplomats' fault that events developed so swiftly. Moreover, our "haste" is also due to the fact that lately we have been having to pay our forces abroad with hard currency, which, as you yourself will appreciate, is to our disadvantage.

[Burbyga] What will happen to the military camps that were constructed with Defense Ministry funds?

[Kopteltsev] That is the most difficult question. They are our buildings, but it is Polish land. By their laws, everything built on that land belongs to Poland.

The question is difficult also because there is no mechanism yet for the transfer of military camps and the various facilities and structures. So property disputes arise between us and the countries where Soviet forces are stationed.

[Burbyga] According to my information, the Soviet delegation at the talks had to get to Warsaw by relay, because the aircraft was not allowed to land at a Polish airfield...

[Kopteltsev] Yes, we flew from Moscow to Brest and then we got to Warsaw by bus. There were financial reasons for it. But I would not pay too much attention to that.

[Burbyga] Polish journalists commenting on the first withdrawal of a missile brigade claimed that it was merely a propaganda stunt by the Soviets.

[Kopteltsev] Few of the journalists would say that... The planned withdrawal of forces has begun.

West Europe

Lukyanov Meets French Foreign Minister in Paris

LD1804213191 Moscow TASS in English 2020 GMT
18 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondents Sergey Batyrev and Viktor Khrekov]

[Text] Paris April 18 TASS—The visiting chairman of the Soviet parliament, Anatoliy Lukyanov, today met French Foreign Minister Roland Dumas for a more than an hour-long conversation that was held in a candid, friendly atmosphere.

Lukyanov told the French minister at his request about the current stage of perestroika and democratization in the Soviet Union. He especially stressed the Soviet leadership's firm commitment to the policy. He also discussed problems relating to the signing of a new treaty of Union.

The two statesmen discussed in major features the problems of the evolution of the international situation, including the realization of the Paris Charter for a New Europe and its aspects connected with the reduction of conventional arms on the continent. They then focused on the key problems of Soviet-French relations and stressed the need to further develop them on the basis of the treaty of concord and cooperation signed last October during President Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to France.

Both sides expressed the desire to fill this treaty with specific substance and facilitate in every possible way the spread of new political thinking.

President of the lower chamber of the French National Assembly Laurent Fabius met Lukyanov at the National Assembly. The Soviet parliamentarian told his French colleague about the ratification by the Soviet parliament of the Soviet-French treaty of concord and cooperation, supported by a weighty majority.

Fabius assured Lukyanov that efforts would be made to have the treaty promptly ratified by the French parliament.

The sides agreed that parliamentarians of both countries should contribute to the realization of the treaty for the sake of deepening bilateral relations.

Lukyanov and Fabius discussed major aspects of the international situation, including the situation in the Middle East. They noted the need for consistent efforts by both sides to stabilize the situation after the Persian Gulf crisis.

Planned NATO Rapid Deployment Force Criticized

*LD1804220691 Moscow TASS in English 2137 GMT
18 Apr 91*

[By TASS military analyst Vladimir Bogachev]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—Secretary General of the West European Union [WEU] Willem de van Eekelen said in his speech in London on Wednesday that new rapid deployment forces proposed by the NATO Military Committee might be used in a critical situation on the border between the Soviet Union and Poland, Czechoslovakia, Hungary or Romania.

If his explanations reflect reality, the significance of the Military Committee recommendations transcends by far the frame of a simple replacement of NATO's troops by new, more perfect ones. In any case Eekelen's statement calls into question the sincerity of the statements earlier made by the leaders of some NATO member countries about their intention to bring their military strategies into line with the changed situation in Europe.

NATO appears to plan to respond to the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the line of confrontation in Europe with a considerable build-up of the mobile component of its armed forces, which will be able to accomplish tasks set to the frontline echelon in case of a surprise attack.

This restructuring of armed forces is justified if strategy is geared to offensive, not defense purposes.

The final decision on the creation of the rapid deployment force numbering from 70,000 to 100,000 men and officers will probably be made by NATO defence ministers at the session of the Military Planning Committee at the end of May.

A question unavoidably rises as to against what countries or country these forces are likely to be used. In what circumstances? Does NATO really claim the right to send rapid deployment forces to Soviet borders? On the basis of which legal norms or agreements? And with what purpose? Does the proposal take into account the possibility of additional measures on the part of the Soviet Union to ensure its security in case NATO concentrates its forces on its borders?

The very proposal to set up major NATO rapid deployment forces in Europe provokes pessimistic thoughts concerning the actual objectives of the North Atlantic Alliance under present conditions.

The deployment of such forces on the continent with their possible use on the borders with the Soviet Union can sharply destabilise the military political situation in the world and reverse positive processes which began in Europe in recent years.

Pavlov Meets Finland's Koivisto, FRG's Waigel

*LD1604102391 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0916 GMT 16 Apr 91*

[Text] London, 16 Apr (TASS)—In the framework of the events pertaining to the opening of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development [EBRD], a meeting took place between V.S. Pavlov, USSR prime minister, and M. Koivisto, president of the Republic of Finland.

The sides exchanged opinions on the situation in bilateral relations in the spirit of trust and mutual interest in maintaining the traditionally high level of Soviet-Finnish contacts and all-around cooperation. M. Koivisto expressed his concern about negative tendencies in the development of Soviet-Finnish commodity circulation, and spoke in favor of urgent measures on both sides to improve the situation. Having supported the president's proposal, V.S. Pavlov analyzed the reasons for the drop in trade and spoke in favor of improving the mechanism of mutual calculations with a purpose of stimulating commodity circulation and preserving cooperational links between the enterprises in both countries.

The president of Finland was briefed on the specific features of the internal situation in the Soviet Union and on the USSR Government measures for stabilization and for the creation of the foundations necessary for a transfer to a market.

M. Koivisto confirmed Finland's adherence to the course of good neighborly relations and close cooperation with the Soviet Union—the course which proved justified—and wished success in the implementation of the reforms that have been planned.

In the course of the London meeting of heads of states and governments of the country-members of the EBRD, V.S. Pavlov, USSR prime minister, met T. Waigel, FRG minister of finance, and had a conversation with him on a number of issues of Soviet-German cooperation. Both sides demonstrated a constructive approach and an aspiration to ensure that the relations between the two states play an initiative-making and stabilizing role in a renewed Europe.

Supreme Soviet

Commissions, Committees Discuss Crisis Program

*LD1804211991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program
Radio-1 Network in Russian 1400 GMT 18 Apr 91*

[Report by correspondent Leonid Lazarevich in Moscow on the 18 April proceedings of the USSR Supreme Soviet]

[Text] Today people's deputies worked in committees and commissions. Their main topic was the same—on the Cabinet of Ministers' action program for extricating the economy from the crisis. And you know, the draft has already been approved in certain commissions, although other commissions are still working on it. But there was also a good deal of criticism.

What did it boil down to, first of all? People's deputies said that the draft had too much waffling: it lacked specific forms and clear time limits. How are we going to solve the crisis, after all? Naturally, people's deputies expect to hear answers to these questions from a representative of the government itself. As far as we know, representatives of committees and commissions will gather in the Kremlin tomorrow to listen to a report by a government representative, and to ask him questions. Our life is very complicated now, and there are very many questions. Therefore the life of people's deputies destined by God to solve these questions is very complicated, too.

In particular, the Consumer Goods, Trade and Municipal, Consumer, and Other Services Commission discussed the issue of the 5 percent tax. This is a complex issue. Now, when prices have gone up to such a degree, the tax annoys many people. There is a desire to free people from this tax. But representatives of the Planning, Budget, and Finance Commission say in their speeches that the tax brings in 20 billion rubles. Where are we going to get money for the budget? Should we start printing money again?

There are many problems and questions. The Commission for Privileges discussed the issue of the notorious dachas, about which so much is being said. They, too, have their conclusion, which will be prepared and submitted to the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet.

Tomorrow the Supreme Soviet will continue its work in the Kremlin.

Shcherbakov Addresses Commission on Crisis Program

*LD1904101691 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program
Radio-1 Network in Russian 0900 GMT 19 Apr 91*

[Report by correspondent Vladimir Perfilyev from the Kremlin]

[Text] Good morning. Today, members of the USSR Supreme Soviet are working in committees and commissions. Traditionally they gather at 27 Kalinin Avenue,

but today a considerable proportion of legislators came to the Kremlin, to the hall where joint sittings of the chambers are usually held.

The majority of committees and commissions started a preliminary discussion of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers' action program for extricating the economy from crisis. Vladimir Ivanovich Shcherbakov, USSR first deputy prime minister, made a report on this issue. I cannot give a detailed account of this report, therefore I will note only the points which, in my view, may be of interest to our listeners.

The first deputy prime minister said that a hard ruble is the basis of everything. It is, precisely, the ruble which can preserve the Union as a single economic space and give freedom to the producer and the consumer. The fact that, unlike earlier, the government does not intend to restrict income—the income of both individuals and enterprises, with a view that this revenue can be used for raising living standards and expanding production—is a fundamentally new one.

Full separation of the credit system from executive power will be another new feature. Extraordinary budgets should be introduced at all levels, while protecting medical care, education and culture, that is, those areas which do not have the possibility to earn income independently.

Vladimir Ivanovich used the following figure of speech: We are still on a spree, whereas we have nothing with which to pay. It seems one has to heed this view.

What will be done to put the situation right? The Cabinet of Ministers intends to create a market at accelerated speed; not to redistribute, but to produce; to develop enterprise, including small enterprises; to continue privatization; to introduce collective forms of ownership; and, what seems very important to me, to revive small business. These are indispensable conditions for solving the crisis, in general.

Vladimir Ivanovich Shcherbakov said that stabilization of the political situation in the country is indispensable for solving these issues. He answered numerous questions from members of the Supreme Soviet. Now there is an interval, after which deputies will start discussing the deputy prime minister's report.

Resolution Endorses Strike Dialogue Statement

*PM1804153591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Resolution signed by Supreme Soviet Chairman A. Lukyanov in Moscow on 16 April: "USSR Supreme Soviet Resolution 'On Statement by USSR Supreme Soviet Industry and Energy and Economic Reform Committees and Soviet of Union Labor and Social Policy Commission'"]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet resolves:

1. To support the statement by the USSR Supreme Soviet Industry and Energy and Economic Reform Committees and the Soviet of the Union Labor and Social Policy Commission that they are ready at any time to examine with the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic parliamentary group and the interrepublic parliamentary groups questions relating to the strikes and ways of resolving them.

2. To appeal to the supreme soviets of all republics to select representatives in order to embark immediately on an examination of the aforementioned questions, which are linked in the closest way with the stabilization of the economy and of the country's sociopolitical situation.

[Signed] A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet
The Kremlin, Moscow, 16 April 1991

Committees' Statement Calls for Strike Dialogue

PM1804152591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[Statement by USSR Supreme Soviet Industry and Energy Committee, USSR Supreme Soviet Economic Reform Committee, and Soviet of Union Labor and Social Policy Commission]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commission are prepared at any time to examine with the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic parliamentary group and the interrepublic parliamentary group questions relating to the strikes and ways of resolving them.

The delay in the establishment of an interrepublic parliamentary group and the postponement of the commencement of its work are aggravating the already grim situation in the country and leading our economy right to the brink of the irreversible processes of national economic collapse. In these conditions the USSR Supreme Soviet committees and commission invite the interrepublic parliamentary groups to start a dialogue as soon as possible.

[Signed] V.Ye. Kurtashin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Industry and Energy Committee V.M. Vologzhin, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Economic Reform Committee N.N. Gritsenko, chairman of the Soviet of the Union Labor and Social Policy Commission

Political & Social

Gorbachev, Kryuchkov Visit Honecker in Hospital

LD1804193791 Hamburg DPA in German
1409 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow (DPA)—Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev and head of the Soviet KGB Vladimir Kryuchkov visited the former GDR state and party

leader Erich Honecker in a military hospital in Moscow a few days ago. The Russian Information Agency (RIA) reported this today, quoting "sources close to military circles." Yesterday the reform-minded MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI reported that Honecker had been visited in the hospital by "two high-ranking politicians."

The ailing Honecker was illegally taken to Moscow from the Soviet military grounds in Beelitz near Berlin in mid-March. His exact whereabouts were not known at first. Later, journalists discovered he was in a military hospital in the Moscow city district of Sokolniki. A clinic spokesman confirmed to DPA by telephone that the prominent patient was indeed there, but refused to give any information about his state of health.

Manayenkov Hopes Plenum Will Strengthen Ranks

LD1904115991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 1100 GMT 19 Apr 91

[Text] Manayenkov, member of the Russian Supreme Soviet and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has described the situation in the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, and the country in general, as extremely unsatisfactory. In the conditions of collapse of the national economy, he noted, in a conversation with the Russian Information Agency correspondent, that there is only one way out: To advance toward a market economy at an accelerated pace.

He also voiced the hope that the forthcoming CPSU Central Committee Plenum will assist in strengthening party ranks. As regards the initiative of Kiev and Leningrad Communists who believe that the top Party leadership should report on their activity, Manayenkov said that this is the will of Communists, and should be respected.

Paper Reports More on Cabinet Crisis Program

PM1704112191

Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA in Russian 17 April 1991 publishes on pages 1 and 2, under the headline "Pavlov's Cabinet Looks to the Market," a 3,200-word unattributed account of the "main measures" of the Cabinet draft action program on the economic crisis, of which the third referent item provides the "full text." The newspaper prefaces its account with the following editorial introduction:

"Yesterday our newspaper published an interview with Academician N. Petrakov, director of the USSR Academy of Sciences Institute of Market Problems, entitled 'Pavlov Cabinet in the Grip of Inflation,' in which he was very unflattering in his comments about the prime minister's policy. The USSR Cabinet of Ministers is under fire from both right and left, the chief reproach being the lack of a clear program and its commitment to directive-based methods of economic

management. How justified are these accusations? We are giving readers themselves the right to draw their own conclusions.

"As many of you clearly remember, on 10 April we began to publish the draft USSR Cabinet of Ministers Action Program for Extricating the Economy From Crisis. Since TASS recalled the text it had earlier transmitted, we were unable to continue publication 11 April as we had promised. Although work on the document has not been completed, we have nevertheless decided to delay no longer and to acquaint readers with the main measures to stabilize the economy proposed by the government."

At the end of its account of the key points of the draft Cabinet program, the paper carries the following note "From the Editorial Office":

"Our account is merely a sketchy reflection of the draft program proposed by the government. From the whole package of measures we have picked only those which we think are of greatest interest to the general reader. But even in this cut-down form—we think that most will agree with us—the document confirms the commitment of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers to a market course in developing the economy and its desire to solve the complex problems facing the country comprehensively, in harmony with the republics' governments.

"The draft program is now being widely discussed by USSR people's deputies, scientists, and leaders of republics, ministries, and departments. Some provisions will certainly be changed. But we decided to allow readers to judge the content of this document without waiting for the final version."

Kravchenko Expulsion From Union 'Unacceptable'

*LD1804203491 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Network in Russian
1800 GMT 18 Apr 91*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Events in the State Television and Radio Company—that is what we are now called—are being widely discussed. We would like to acquaint you with the decision of our organization of journalists. We have received it here.

The Directorate of the USSR Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting] Journalists' Organization has learned from the press about the decree of the Moscow Secretariat of the Union of Journalists regarding Leonid Petrovich Kravchenko's exclusion from membership of the union.

Noting that the Gosteleradio Journalists' Organization was presented with a fait accompli with this decree, the Directorate feels it necessary to note that the adoption of a decision of this nature without taking account of the views of the primary journalist's organization of USSR's Gosteleradio and acting practically behind their back is

in principle incorrect and unacceptable. It is a clear violation of the character and principles of the creative union. It is also in principle incorrect and unacceptable to violate the right of a member of the USSR Journalists Union to be present when his fate is being decided and to have his case heard. If the given decree remains in force, it will establish a precedent affording the opportunity of violating the rights of any member of the creative union at any time, and the Directorate of the Gosteleradio Journalists' Organization cannot agree to this.

This decision was adopted unanimously.

Poll Shows Communists' Confidence Reviving

*PM1504082391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Apr 91 Second Edition p 3*

[Article by Doctor of Philosophical Sciences Professor V. Boykov under the "In the Mirror of Sociology" rubric: "We Are Finding Confidence"]

[Text] The crisis within the party has not yet been overcome. But a way out has appeared quite distinctly. The results of a study conducted by sociologists from the Academy of Social Sciences under the leadership of Zh. Toshchenko and Ye. Okhotskiy attest to this. The data on which they base their conclusion regarding the CPSU's recovery is quite impressive: Some 1,600 Communists were polled in 19 republic, kray, and oblast party organizations, along with 910 secretaries of primary cells, 129 heads of union republic communist party central committee, kraykom, and obkom [kray and oblast party committee] organizational departments, and hundreds of people who recently quit the party.

What form have the positive changes taken? They have by no means manifested themselves in Communists emerging from the notorious trenches to launch an offensive on political pluralism and democratic forces. Nor do these changes have anything in common with the orthodox understanding and practical hyperbolizing of class interests. The CPSU revival is apparent above all in the fact that Communists' frame of mind is becoming increasingly consonant with the general civilized values of freedom of conscience, a civil society, and a market system of economic management with its innate business initiative, high evaluation of conscientious labor, lack of shortages, etc.

The uniform political thinking and intolerance of dissent which prevailed within the party are being overcome. For instance, 65 percent of Communists see nothing wrong in developing a multiparty system within our society and deem it necessary to cooperate with other parties, while more than one-third see the utility of forming various currents and platforms within the CPSU. Some 46 percent of party secretaries polled also support the presence of currents and platforms within the party. This notwithstanding, the relative majority of respondents consider themselves committed to the decisions of the 28th CPSU Congress.

Some 48 percent of Communists polled and 65 percent of party secretaries are guided by the program statement issued by the 28th CPSU Congress. Other figures are as follows: Marxist Platform (14 and 10 percent respectively); Communist reformists (12 and 10 percent); Initiative Congress of Communists of Russia (6 and 4 percent), and "Yedinstvo" ["Unity"] (3 and 1 percent).

The fact that the positions of the overwhelming majority of those polled coincide on key problems related to extricating the country from the crisis attracts attention. These include such problems as preserving the USSR within its present borders, creating equal opportunities for the development of various forms of ownership, and improving all progressive forces' cooperation among themselves and with the soviets for the sake of civil peace.

The fact that Communists are gradually acquiring confidence in the party's ability to remain the ruling party and extricate society from the crisis is an equally significant indication that the state of affairs within the CPSU is improving. This confidence was voiced by 63 percent of those polled, while roughly one-third doubt or even unequivocally do not believe in its success. Last fall the ratio here was the other way around.

A weighty argument confirming CPSU stabilization resides in the fact that the tendency for its ranks to dwindle is slackening off. Whereas in November 1990 66 percent of party members firmly intended to keep their party membership, 13 percent intended to surrender their party cards, and the rest were undecided, today these indicators are 74, 12, and 14 percent respectively. In other words, we can forecast a further quantitative reduction in CPSU ranks of 1.5-2 million people. But it is equally likely that this process will abate. Incidentally, a poll of 892 former party members showed that 12 percent of them doubt the correctness of their decision to leave the party and there are even those who intend to return to it.

I must stress that the exodus from the CPSU and many other destructive phenomena within it are linked with Communists losing their former guidelines and having an insufficiently clear idea of the future of the party and society as a whole. For instance, one of the main reasons for their giving up their party cards is their loss of faith in socialist ideals. But it is often not ideals but phony ideals that are mentioned—pseudocollectivism, class intolerance, socioeconomic leveling, etc. It is a good thing that these have finally been laid low. But that is not enough. It is important for Communists to acquire genuine material and intellectual values. The new CPSU Program is designed to facilitate their quest.

GLASNOST Publishes Lenin Poll Results

LD1804113791 Moscow TASS in English 1102 GMT
18 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—The question about the attitude to V.I. Lenin and his ideological and theoretical

heritage was put to some 9,000 people in 37 districts of the USSR during opinion polls over the past two years. The results of the polls were published today by the Moscow socio-political weekly GLASNOST.

The polls established that 59 per cent of the respondents believe that Lenin's idea of the 1917 October Revolution was "right, but has not been implemented".

The reasons for the criticism of Lenin's heritage were also analysed. It was established that about an equal number of respondents believed that this criticism is either linked with the "unjustifiably distorted interpretation of Lenin's theoretical conclusions by Stalin," or "with the attempt to discredit the idea of socialism."

A considerable number of respondents believe that there are intentions "to denigrate the Soviet Communist Party by discrediting Lenin's ideas."

Nevertheless, the results of the polls show that interest in Lenin's theoretical heritage has increased from 1988. Such is the opinion of 64 per cent of those polled. Lenin's activity was highly appraised by 73 per cent of the respondents, while for 70 per cent Lenin's heritage is a yardstick for analysing contemporary phenomena and processes of public life.

The public opinion polls were conducted by the Department of Psychology and Sociology of Politics of the Academy of Social Sciences at the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee.

1992 Press Subscription Procedures Examined

91UN1312A Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
13 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1

[Article by T. Chudyakova: "The Soyuzpechat Spring Offensive Against Publishers and Readers on the Eve of the Subscription Campaign"]

[Text] On 11 April the Ministry of Communications conducted a conference devoted to issues related to 1992 subscriptions. Actually, the gathering did not bear much resemblance to a conference. Those in attendance—mostly publishers' representatives—were presented, almost in the form of an ultimatum, with new terms of payment for the delivery and distribution of publications.

The document that contains these new terms "gets to the point" right away. The suggested period for buying subscriptions is between 1 August and 1 November. The Soyuzpechat [Main Administration for Distribution of Printed Matter of the USSR Ministry of Communications] catalog will include only those publications whose publishers accept the Ministry of Communications terms and also enclose with the contract, on a mandatory basis, a copy of each publication's registration license.

Also made public was the table that contains the cost of placing information in the catalog—177 rubles [R] for each line plus R20 for each change in the text. Those who

want the information on the progress of the subscription to their publications will have to fork out another R4,200.

There is also a brand new proposal—to create an insurance fund to pay for the work involved in refunding the money if a publication closes, for making changes in subscription terms, for issues published behind schedule, and for refunds to subscribers for issues that are not published on time. The contribution is set in the amount equal to the value of the subscription share of one month total circulation.

In addition, Soyuzpechat has made a final and irreversible decision to charge all losses resulting from unsold retail copies to the publishers.

But these, you understand, were just the first intimations of what was to be presented to the publishers (and the readers since their interests are also directly affected) in the speeches by the republic Ministries of Communications and Soyuzpechat branch staff of various ranks. The subject was the changeover to new terms of payment for the delivery and distribution of publications.

It is being planned to introduce as of now a contract system and tariffs for postal services. The basis of calculations is the cost of transportation and delivery of each copy of a newspaper or magazine, calculated in kopeks. The tariff will depend on the number of pages and the distance over which the publication is to be delivered.

All republic representatives declared firmly that they would rather avoid conflicts and that they are definitely against raising prices of publications again. But the reality is this: The cost of transportation by rail has gone up four times, and by air even more—Aeroflot now demands R1,200 for one hour of flight instead of the previous R130. This is why the distribution of central publications is unprofitable, and therefore not to the local branches' advantage.

To correct the situation, communications personnel are offering a variety of options. For instance, Lithuania intends to charge 10-12 kopeks for the delivery of each issue of a newspaper or magazine. In addition to introducing new tariffs, Moldova and Kazakhstan propose to appeal to the government to reduce the tax on profits in order to have some development funds.

Many other radical measures on how to strengthen the economic side of the industry were proposed. It is suggested that the publishers take upon themselves expenses related to the shipping of newspapers and magazines, pay for the delivery of publications from decentralized printing facilities to oblast centers (or build such facilities with their own resources), ensure quality packaging, and implement the Leningrad method by which publishers set aside part of their payroll fund to increase the salaries of newspaper stand personnel. And, of course, stiffer fines for falling behind in the publication schedule.

To say that this high-class no-win situation left those present in a state of shock would be an understatement. Not a single presentation by the "other" side contained even a hint that a contract (since this is the hefty word the authors chose to describe their proposals) should be based on the obligations of both sides.

Totally endearing is also the touching concern for the readers on the part of the communications people. Yes, they are against raising prices of publications, since a sharp reduction in circulation will also affect their financial well-being. But the situation in which the publishers are placed by the new tariffs was convincingly demonstrated by the representative of the Business World concern. They calculated that of each 30 kopek newspaper they will have to pay 25 kopeks in distribution costs for each subscription copy and 28 kopeks for each retail copy. What will the publisher exist on then?

The communications people do not have an answer to this question. Therefore the speech by Ye. Manyakin, USSR deputy minister of communications, who declared that the Union ministry no longer has any levers of authority and that the terms are dictated by the republics, was truly significant. There is no choice but to comply! The transportation industry diktat will also have to be accepted: You have to pay up—this is not meat or baby food.

To the proposal to conduct business in a civilized manner and not to change the terms of contracts that have already been signed, Yevgeniy Alekseyevich replied just as decisively that we do not live in a civilized country, and therefore if during the year the price for some service or other changes, postal tariffs will change accordingly.

Summarizing what was said and appraising the situation soberly as an impasse, one can only hope for the one straw of salvation—the proposal, brought up at the conference, to immediately create a publishers association, which would solve problems of the delivery and distribution of newspapers and magazines on the basis of truly direct contracts with communications people in the localities. Without a middleman by the name of Soyuzpechat.

CPSU CC Commission Discusses Party Budget

*PM1804154391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Apr 91 Second Edition p 3*

[A. Petrushov article: "Not Just a Gesture; From the CPSU Central Committee Session on the CPSU's Financial and Economic Activity"]

[Text] The more democratic and flexible the CPSU becomes, the fiercer and more frenzied the attacks on it. Its budget and its financial and economic activity have become subjects of particular speculation. Distorted ideas about the formation and expenditure of the budget are being methodically put about. Their aim is unambiguous—to bring about a crisis of confidence between the

party "elite" and the "grassroots." That is why the 28th CPSU Congress instructed party central organs—the Central Committee and Central Control Commission—to elaborate a new mechanism for forming, implementing, and monitoring the party budget. As is well known, the draft of this mechanism has been drawn up and published in the press. During the discussion the CPSU Central Committee received numerous proposals from local level. Enriched by these proposals, the draft was examined 8 April by the CPSU Central Committee commission under the chairmanship of Yu.A. Manayenkov, Central Committee secretary.

A report was delivered by N.Ye. Kruchina, CPSU Central Committee administrator of affairs. He noted that this is the first time that such a mechanism has been adopted. What is the essence of it? In its budgetary policy the CPSU proceeds on the basis of the principles of self-financing, the transition by union republic communist parties to providing for their spending out of their own sources of revenue, glasnost in the formation and implementation of the party budget, the subordination of the budget to the interests of party organizations and Communists, and party organizations' autonomy in drawing up and dispensing the budget and in resolving structural, staffing, pay, production, economic, and other questions under their jurisdiction. Thus, union republic communist parties' autonomy in resolving financial and budget issues is reinforced. Needless to say, they can, if necessary, count on material help (subsidies) from the CPSU budget, to the extent that its financial abilities permit.

As for primary party organizations, up to 50 percent of incoming membership dues, voluntary contributions, and income from other sources which does not contravene legislation is used to finance them. To preserve their funds and engage in financial operations primary party organizations are entitled to open accounts at bank branches under the established procedure, or to use the funds and accounts of the relevant rayon party committee [raykom], city party committee, or okrug party committee.

Funds unspent in the current year as well as profits from primary party organizations' own production and economic activity are retained by primary party organizations. The removal of a primary party organization's funds by higher party committees without its consent is not permitted.

Any funds saved once the party budget has been implemented also remain at the disposal of union republic communist parties. These funds are used for their activity and to ensure targeted party programs and measures.

The draft mechanism clearly defines the CPSU Central Committee's powers. The central budget is drawn up from deductions from publishing house profits, revenue from production and economic activity by the CPSU

Central Committee Administration of Affairs, its subunits, facilities, and organizations under the jurisdiction of departments, some of the membership dues paid by Communists registered outside their territorial party organizations, funds allocated by CPSU Central Committee decision from the party's insurance fund, and other revenue which does not contravene legislation. Union republic communist parties also contribute to it. The size of these deductions is determined when the budget is drawn up by agreement between the CPSU Central Committee and union republic communist party central committees.

Centralized funds are used to finance the activities of the CPSU Central Committee and Central Control Commission, central party institutions and educational establishments, branches of the V.I. Lenin Central Museum, the development of the material base of party organizations and party publishing houses, and other programs, events, and projects of partywide importance which are financed by decision of the CPSU Central Committee.

Implementation of the CPSU budget is controlled in accordance with the CPSU Central Committee statute, while local budgets are controlled by the superior party committees, control commissions, and control and auditing commissions.

V. Doroshenko, first secretary of Kazankovskiy Ukrainian Communist Party Raykom in Nikolayev Oblast; A. Kadyrbekov, first secretary of Sovetskiy Kazakh Communist Party Raykom in Alma-Ata; V. Lyakishev, party committee secretary at the Motor Industry Technology Scientific Research Institute (Moscow); A. Chausov, party committee secretary at the Chelyabinsk Metallurgical Combine, and others took part in discussing the draft. The discussion was heated in a number of places. But everyone agreed on one point: The new mechanism is not just a gesture to the times we live in, but a major support in resolving the tasks of the CPSU's organizational and political strengthening. The idea was expressed that this document needs to be quickly adopted and introduced into party life. Time is short.

Taking account of the discussion, the draft was recommended to the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat.

The commission then examined spending estimates for the upkeep of central party institutions in 1991. N. Kapanets, Central Committee deputy administrator of affairs, spoke on this issue. Leaders of party institutions who had been invited to the session took part in the discussion. Spending on certain areas of the estimates has been cut by 3.7 million rubles. In the commission's opinion, the funds allocated are a ceiling which it would be rash for party institutions to exceed in their first year of operating in the context of the introduction of the market economy into the country's national economic complex.

TASS Reviews Central Press for 19 Apr

*LD1904063491 Moscow TASS in English 0626 GMT
19 Apr 91*

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow April 19 TASS—Today's newspapers highlight Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan.

The Soviet president and the Japanese prime minister discussed bilateral relations and a peace treaty between the Soviet Union and Japan, newspapers report.

The signing of bilateral agreements capped the third day of Gorbachev's official visit.

The talks were very difficult, but were held in a business-like and frank atmosphere, Gorbachev told PRAVDA.

The talks ended with the passage of a Soviet-Japanese statement and the signing of several agreements.

Gorbachev also met students and teachers from Japanese universities, newspapers report.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA covers a meeting between Gorbachev and Japanese business representatives.

The results of the Tokyo talks demonstrate the determination of Tokyo and Moscow to make a decisive step towards understanding and settling problems remaining from the war, including territorial delineation.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes about the miners' strike. Russian authorities agreed to pay striking miners, the newspaper reports.

The newspaper blasted the unprecedented Russian government decision "to pay the vanguard of the working class, as miners like to call themselves, for undermining the economy".

The Russian parliament began work on Thursday, newspapers report. The legislature will discuss social economic issues and elections and the status of the Russian president.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA highlights a speech by I.E. Klockov, chairman of the Federation of Russian Independent Trade Unions, who called for a one-hour warning strike on April 26.

TRUD writes about an epidemic of strikes sweeping the Soviet Union. It carries a letter by V.P. Shcherbakov, chairman of the Soviet Confederation of Trade Unions, to Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov.

People are losing hope for a better life, there is mounting doom and hopelessness. "we are on the brink of serious upheavals," Shcherbakov writes.

PRAVDA and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA publish an interview with Russian Communist Party leader Ivan Polozkov, who speaks about Communist tactics in the Russian parliament.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA publishes a draft Russian constitution prepared by Russian people's deputies from the Communists of Russia faction.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA reports the opening on April 20 of a conference of prominent Soviet politicians such as Vadim Bakatin, Yegor Ligachev, Eduard Shevardnadze and Boris Pugo. The conference will discuss the future of the country.

The newspaper publishes a statement by the Bureau of the Komsomol Central Committee on the occasion of the 121st birth anniversary of Vladimir Lenin.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA comments on confidence-building measures in Asia Mikhail Gorbachev put forward in Vladivostok five years ago.

TASS Reviews Central Press for 18 Apr

*LD1804072291 Moscow TASS in English 0650 GMT
18 Apr 91*

["Soviet Press Review"—TASS headline]

Moscow April 18 TASS—Today's newspapers highlight Mikhail Gorbachev's visit to Japan.

On Wednesday, Gorbachev and Japanese Prime Minister Toshiko Kaifu met to discuss key international issues.

Newspapers cover Gorbachev's visit to the Japanese parliament and his speech before deputies.

Gorbachev also met Social Democratic Party Executive Committee Chairman Takako Doi to "discuss his visit to Japan and Soviet-Japanese relations."

Newspapers report Gorbachev's meeting with leading Japanese business representatives.

PRAVDA publishes speeches Kaifu and Gorbachev exchanged at a dinner Kaifu hosted in the honour of Gorbachev and his wife Raisa on Wednesday.

The two chambers of the Soviet parliament met on Wednesday separately to discuss urgent measures to increase the role of the Soviet prosecutor's office in promoting law and order in the country.

Soviet parliament chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov began an official visit to France on Wednesday, PRAVDA reports.

PRAVDA carries an article by academician Viktor Afanasyev about fundamental sciences and market relations.

Newspapers publish stories in the run up to Vladimir Lenin's 121st birth anniversary.

PRAVDA reports that the government decision to raise prices in worker canteens threatens to heighten social tensions in the country.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA publishes a Russian bill "On the Russian State Tax Service" and the bill "On Changes in the Criminal, Civil, Criminal Procedural, Civil Procedural and Administrative Codes".

The newspaper writes about the need to modernise animal husbandry.

RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA carries an account by Russian People's Deputy Yuriy Gulko before his electors.

The Rospadskaya mine—the largest in the Soviet Union—began work in Kuzbass on Wednesday, newspapers report, commenting on the miners' strike.

TRUD writes about who wrote former Defence Minister Andrey Grechko's memoirs.

PRAVDA carries an interview with Michael Emerson, the first representative of the Commission of European Communities in the Soviet Union.

Prospects for the development of economic and political ties between the EC and the Soviet Union are immense, Emerson said.

Economic

Striking Miners Reach Agreement in Ukraine

AU1904074291 Paris AFP in English 0736 GMT
19 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow, April 19 (AFP)—Striking coal miners in the Ukraine have agreed to return to work after the Ukraine authorities agreed to meet their economic demands, a journalist with the Ukrainian press agency said Friday.

The two sides signed a protocol agreement late Thursday, under which they agreed to return to work by Saturday, ending a seven-week strike, said the journalist contacted by telephone.

A representative of the miners' strike committee contacted by telephone said that the agreement still had to be ratified by miners in each mine at meetings due to be held later Friday.

The unofficial agency INTERFAX said that the miners had won agreement for "index-linking" of their salaries, limited to increases of 100 to 150 per cent because of the financial situation of the republic.

The Ukraine authorities also pledged immunity for strikers, except those "involved in illegal action", INTERFAX said.

"We fear reprisals against strikers, sackings," the strike committee spokesman said.

But the Ukraine parliament decided that the miners' political demands—notably the resignation of Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev—would have to be dealt with by the central government.

The agreement was the latest between striking miners and local authorities, bypassing central government which has refused the wage demands, often assorted with calls for the resignation of President Mikhail Gorbachev, of striking coal miners who have severely disrupted production across the country for several weeks. [sentence as received]

Siberian miners ended a strike at the Soviet Union's largest coal mine Thursday after reaching an accord with the government of the Russian Federation to come under its jurisdiction.

The Rospadskaya mine in Siberia's Kuzbass region had previously been under the control of the Soviet coal industry ministry.

Strikers in Belorussia have also begun talks with regional leaders and have maintained calls for the central government to resign.

Suspend Strike for Two Days

LD1804191191 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak
Network in Russian 1800 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] The Ukrainian miners' strike is suspended for the next two days and all coal industry enterprises in the republic are resuming work. This was contained in a joint protocol by representatives of the parliament and the government of the republic and also strike committees after the miners' demands were met. The protocol was read out at a session of the Supreme Soviet of the Ukrainian Republic.

Silayev Holds 'Productive' Meeting With Miners

LD1804232391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network
in Russian 2030 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Create a commission and draw up a set of measures to transfer coal enterprises to Russia's jurisdiction within 10 days: The main result of the meeting between Ivan Silayev, the republic's prime minister, and representatives of miners' collectives can be described with this phrase.

In the view of the majority of participants, it turned out to be more productive than the recent meeting with leaders of the Union Government.

Speaking about the strikes, Ivan Silayev nevertheless stressed that the miners' political demands must be resolved by the central organs of government.

Strike Tensions Run 'High' in Kuzbass

LD1804120691 Moscow TASS in English 1143 GMT
18 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Grigoriy Shalakin]

[Text] Kemerovo, Western Siberia April 18 TASS—A trainload of coal, the first after the strike began here, left the country's largest Rospadskaya coal mine today.

The mine has switched under the jurisdiction of Russia and begun compensating for the loss inflicted by the strike, which amounts to 30 million roubles. Miners at Rospadskaya and the republican government agreed that the strike seriously limited the republic's opportunities and those of its partners.

Many collectives in Kiselevsk, Prokopyevsk and Mezhdurechensk in the Kuzbass coal field voted for the transition from the Soviet Coal Industry Ministry to being under Russia's jurisdiction. So far, the republic has failed to take a decision, and the strike continues.

Tensions are still running high in Kuzbass. Over 50 coal mining enterprises, including 47 out of 76 mines, are idle. The rate of coal production equals some 67 per cent of that in March. In March, the loss amounted to two million tonnes of coal. This time, in less than three weeks, the loss has amounted to three million tonnes.

Moscow's Miners' Solidarity Fund Described

PM1704133991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
11 Apr 91 Union Edition p 6

[V. Ardayev report: "Muscovites Help Miners"]

[Text] A miners' solidarity fund, organized by the Independent Trade Union of Mine Workers and the Interregional Strike Committee, has been in operation in Moscow for about a month.

In the single room where the fund is located, one corner is almost piled to the ceiling with boxes overflowing with bundles, parcels, and cans—"Hercules" oats, tea, vermicelli, preserves... On the table there is a box with a slit—for money. The telephone rings constantly. Two people are on duty in the room—Anatoliy Dubrov from Vorkuta, and Yevgeniy Zykov from Novokuznetsk. They are miners.

"Dozens of people call and drop by each day," they said. "All donations are scrupulously accounted for. Produce goes immediately to the mines and open pits, and the money is paid into a special independent trade union account. Money transfers are also deposited in this account. Initially, money was transferred to strike committee regional accounts, but now many of them are blocked and the money has begun to come back to us..."

Incidentally, it is not only the regional bank accounts that are being blocked. The fund's activists maintain a daily operational link with the mining collectives, ascertaining exactly which mines and open pits are at a standstill and for how long. Recently, an increasing number of Donbass, Kuzbass, and Vorkuta telephones have been "out of order," calls are not being answered. In many places around the capital, solidarity fund announcements have been neatly sabotaged. Nevertheless, more and more people are hearing about this room on the Arbat, and another collection point for donations near the "Democratic Russia" headquarters on Tverskaya Street.

Two people entered the room with me—a man and a woman. The man brought an envelope of money collected from colleagues and scientists from the USSR Academy of Science Institute for Water Problems (already the fourth such donation from this collective), and a personal gift of a kilo of sugar. The woman pushed several notes into the cashbox: "My sister asked me to take them. You know, for her 30 rubles [R] is a lot of money: She has an invalid daughter..."

I spoke to A. Sergeyev, deputy chairman of the Independent Trade Union of Mine Workers Executive Bureau.

"The first large-scale action in Moscow to collect money to support striking miners took place 10 March during the meeting on Manezh Square," Aleksandr recalled. "That time, they managed to collect R176,000 in a couple of hours. A short while later, the strike committee coordination council was set up and it took control of this matter. Part of the money has already been sent to miners' with large families. All in all, today there is around R500,000 in the independent trade union account—from donations and members' contributions. This is very little. According to the most modest calculations, at least R20 million are needed to support the strikers. As the strike continues, even more money will be needed—especially as the talks between the mine workers and the government did not give the expected result and there has been a fresh increase in the number of idle mines."

Sergeyev explained also that the coordination council plans initially to use the money to purchase produce for miners' families—at preferential prices. A number of individual farmers in particular are prepared to accommodate the miners in this respect.

One-Hour Strike in RSFSR Called For 26 April

LD1804110791 Moscow All-Union Radio First
Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0900 GMT
18 Apr 91

[Report by correspondent Vladimir Korablev from Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet]

[Excerpts] [Korablev] Klochkov, chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia, spoke at the session. He told deputies about the extraordinary plenum of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia which had been held and of the resolution adopted at that plenum, of the all-Russia warning protest action for 26 April in the form of a one hour halt to work of enterprises, institutions, organizations, transport, and a work-to-rule by some labor collectives. [passage omitted]

I have the resolution of the 8th Plenum of the Council of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions here and it says in paragraph 2:

Working people and student youth are called on to support the demands of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions upon the supreme bodies of state power and administration of the USSR and RSFSR.

Here are the specific demands being made:

Lift restrictions on wage increases; draft and implement an anti-crisis program; lift the 5 percent tax on purchases and services; lift the 1 percent tax on pensions; ensure accessible prices at workers', school, and student canteens; and establish a minimum holiday of 24 working days.

[Announcer] And how did the session react to it?

[Korablev] The information was taken note of but I would like to say also that the chairman of the Federation of Independent Trade Unions of Russia asked the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation to stop the political confrontation and get down first to adopting laws connected with social protection of the population of the republic.

Officials on Reconstruction, Development Bank

Gerashchenko on Governors Board

LD1704211591 Moscow TASS in English 2041 GMT
17 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Aleksandr Sisnev]

[Text] London April 17 TASS—Numerous contacts on the eve and after the inauguration of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD) showed that the attitude to Soviet participation in this international financial organisation is positive, Soviet state bank chairman Viktor Gerashchenko told TASS here today.

He represents the Soviet Union on the EBRD board of governors.

"Our country participates in an international organisation of this type for the first time," Gerashchenko stressed. "We have great hopes that the bank will give adequate technical assistance to the Soviet Union, as well as credits to implement economic projects.

"We also hope that the EBRD will be an example for other international organisations and individual companies. Organisations of the EBRD type can have positive influence on the development of business relations.

"When private investors and commercial banks see that international institutions with a high level of examination help implement economic projects in some or other countries, they more readily make investments and establish commercial contacts. We need precisely this to carry out our reforms."

Turning to the position of the United States and Japan, which put forth several reservations concerning loans to

the USSR by the bank, Gerashchenko said that the approach of each country is determined not only by economic but also by political considerations.

He stressed at the same time that during talks that preceded the establishment of the bank, EBRD members reached a compromise raising hopes for fruitful cooperation in the future.

The Soviet representative noted that, during the three initial years when the EBRD is amassing capital, the USSR will limit its loans to the sum of its contribution.

"We understand that our active work in the bank, the operation of our representatives in the EBRD and the progress of economic reforms in the USSR will help improve the situation so that the board of governors would not be guided by pure political considerations."

It is difficult to say when the Soviet Union is granted its first loan. Gerashchenko said that the bank received several applications. "However, we should remember that the board of governors, executive directors and the entire staff have just begun their work. Therefore, it is difficult to speak about any specific period."

Pavlov on Joining EBRD

LD1804083191 Moscow TASS in English 0658 GMT
18 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Igor Bulanov]

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—"The conditions for credits to the Soviet Union by the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development [EBRD] have been settled. This opens up good prospects for our membership in the bank," Soviet Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov told TASS on Thursday.

Pavlov was speaking about the results of his visit to London, where he attended the inauguration of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development.

Pavlov noted that the Soviet Union for the first time joined an international financial organisation as a full fledged member. "It is especially important now that some branches in the country's industry cannot function normally because of restrictions on credits," he said.

New Small Bills Reportedly Already Printed

914A0622A Moscow KOMMERSANT in Russian No 9
25 Feb-4 Mar 91 p 1

[Report by Grigoriy Volchek: "New 25-Ruble Bills Are Already Being Printed"]

[Text] According to information received by KOMMERSANT last week from informed unofficial sources, the USSR Ministry of Finance Goznak [State Mint] minting factory in Perm is printing full speed the new 25-ruble denomination bills of the 1991 issue. KOMMERSANT learned at the same time that there is a plan to introduce

a new type of savings passbooks that will be used as checkbooks (or credit cards) in paying for large purchases in state retail stores.

Thus, the new information confirms the forecast made in KOMMERSANT No. 54. The monetary reform will continue along two lines: first, a continuing exchange of banknotes and, second, the expansion of noncash operations and the use of other measures directed at "locking up" the money in noncash circulation.

According to our sources, which include a number of printers, warehouse workers, engravers, and matrix makers of the Goznak factory, the enterprise started printing new banknotes at the beginning of February. By their description, the new banknotes are an almost exact copy of the old ones—only some color fragments in the design have been changed. For instance, ornamental rosettes that contain the digits indicating the banknote denomination "25" (there are two of them on the face and one on the back of the note) are a different color on the new notes. Also, the date "1961" has been removed from the edge of the banknote face, and the date "1991" placed over the rosette.

According to our sources, the printing of 25-ruble notes is a completely new undertaking for the Goznak Perm printing factory: In the past, the factory specialized in printing small denominations. However, from a purely technological point of view all the abovementioned changes in the appearance of the banknotes are, according to the factory personnel, very minor. The quality of special paper (including its protective qualities) and of the dies also remains the same. Because of this, according to plant employees, a minimal period of time—about one work week—was all that was needed to prepare for the printing of the new banknotes.

The administration of the Goznak Perm printing factory categorically denies the information received by KOMMERSANT. For instance, plant director Yuri Medvedev declared that "this information is not based on any reality."

It should be noted, however, that this new information on the printing of the 25-ruble banknotes complements in an interesting way previously received unofficial data that another—Moscow—Goznak factory is printing one-, three-, and five-ruble denominations of the new issue (see KOMMERSANT No. 7, 1991).

If we believe both sources, there follows a conclusion that an exchange of small denomination bills is being prepared. And it is to take place in the nearest future—the analysis of inflationary processes that have taken place in February are evidence of this (see more detail on the level of inflation in February on page 19).

At the same time, most specialists agree that the mechanics of exchanging the 25-ruble banknotes and smaller denomination bills—if such an exchange is to

take place—will most likely be very different from the scheme used on 23 January in the exchange of large denomination bills.

The specialists believe that this exchange will be conducted without unneeded hardship.

Experts believe that during a relatively long time the old and new bills will coexist—as was the case during the monetary reform of 1961. The new banknotes will be introduced gradually into circulation (in the process of paying salaries and withdrawal of deposits), while the old issue bills that arrive at the bank—for instance, from retail stores—will be taken out of circulation.

Simultaneously with the news about the printing of the 25-ruble bills, KOMMERSANT also received unofficial information from the USSR Gosbank [State Bank] in regard to indexation of savings accounts related to retail price reform. As we have learned, accounts that hold deposits of over 1,000 rubles [R] will possibly be indexed on a regressive scale. That is, deposits of up to R1,000 will be increased in proportion to the average price increase (60 percent), but larger deposits will be increased in a smaller proportion with the rule being that the larger the deposits, the less the indexation ratio.

In this respect, experts believe that dispersion of deposits, which is today used by many large depositors, will hardly be of help in getting full compensation for the losses caused by devaluation of savings resulting from price increases. According to information received by this correspondent in the USSR Gosbank, the deposit losses caused by the price reform will be indexed for each depositor, not the deposit.

It is quite possible, for instance, that before the indexation a new type of passbooks will be introduced (only one for each depositor), the serial numbers of which will be entered into their owners' passports. According to some predictions, deposits that are not moved to this new account will simply be annulled.

It is also possible that these books will have a new status: It would be possible to use them as checkbooks (or credits cards) in paying for large purchases in the state stores.

Thus, the new information received by KOMMERSANT confirms the prognosis made in No. 54: The monetary reform will continue along two lines: first, a continuing exchange of banknotes, and second, the expansion on noncash operations and the use of other measures directed at "locking up" the money in noncash circulation.

Work on Economic Legislation Viewed

PM1704153291 Paris BUSINESS IN THE USSR
in English No 11, Apr 91 p 14

[Aleksandr Zaychenko article: "Nearing the Critical Mass"]

[Text] A packet of economic laws and regulations, a crucial part of a market infrastructure, is still being written. For nearly 18 months now, the process has proceeded unabated, defying political ups and downs or the changing balance between rival forces. The seemingly monotonous hum of the law-making machine is but a disguise for continuous evolution and development of the legislative effort. The achievements are evident from two basic parameters: the number of newly-adopted laws and their quality. In both areas, progress has been dramatic. And yet as long as it does not reach a critical mass, i.e. the required quantity of underlying legislation (it could be twenty or thirty laws, or more—nobody knows), there will be no single market space, while the scarce laws and regulations already adopted will be no more important than museum exhibits, remaining ineffective in the absence of a friendly combination of conditions, prerequisites and factors of a market economy.

The quality of the laws varies. The general tendency to seek world standards of economic legislation is clearly manifest. The updated, revised versions of the laws on cooperatives and industrial enterprises have been followed over the past few weeks by more or less radical regulations on employment, entrepreneurial activities and hard-currency transactions. We ought to revise our uncompromisingly negative attitude to a series of unpopular presidential decrees (although some of them are economically unproductive and have been apparently motivated by short-term political considerations in the struggle for power). We are living in an environment which is economically, politically, legally and morally distorted to the point where the laws of logic and the obvious linkages between the degree of freedom enjoyed by people in their different pursuits still do not work.

And yet we must not ignore the fact that, despite the recent abrupt lurch to the right, the federal legislature adopted its most radical laws between January and March, in an apparent attempt to put the economy firmly on a market footing. These steps included regulations on entrepreneurial activities, hard-currency transactions and consumer-rights protection. Even bolder moves can be expected concerning privatization and anti-monopoly regulations.

The measure on entrepreneurial activities is, perhaps, the most unusual of the legislature's recent efforts. No such laws protecting businessmen's rights exist in industrialized countries, if only because they don't need any—all such rights have long since been enshrined in the constitutions and civil legislation of the said countries. In the Soviet Union, whose constitution was written under the totalitarian system and whose public opinion remains hostile to businessmen, such a law is a real breakthrough, as it recognizes the basic human right to do business and ensures legislatively the right of business to exist legally.

For the first time in Soviet legal practice, private enterprise is introduced as a legal category and even protected

by the state on a par with state and collective management. The subjects of free enterprise are not only juridical but also physical persons, meaning that anyone can do business even without establishing a commercial enterprise; for example, by undertaking regular or irregular business ventures at his or her own risk. This puts an effective end to the disgraceful articles of the Criminal Codes of the Soviet republics, which see private enterprise of any kind as a criminal offence. (In 1990, more than 50 people were sentenced on charges invoked by the said articles.) A truly revolutionary article of the new law is the one allowing private entrepreneurs to use hired labour. This effectively dissolves the old myth of communist ideology about hired labour as the chief source of profit by exploitation, to be vehemently opposed (although the Soviet state's standard of exploiting hired labour is higher than anywhere in the world). The concluding article of the newly-adopted regulation is also unprecedented, as it proclaims state support for entrepreneurial activities. If the spirit permeating the law on entrepreneurship were maintained in other economic regulations adopted recently, soviet economic legislation would very soon reach world quality standards.

The law on hard-currency regulation also appears dramatic. Having recovered from the ailment of "foreign economic sovereignty of particular enterprises," this country is finally recognizing the rouble as the only paying instrument on its territory, while at the same time allowing hard-currency trading, albeit within certain limits. The law gives permission to Soviet enterprises and nations, provided they have obtained the official permission of the USSR State Bank Gosbank, to open accounts in foreign banks.

Conversely, foreign companies and private citizens can open rouble accounts (also under the vigilant eye of Gosbank) in Soviet banks.

Although the hard-currency regulation falls short of being a "bill of foreign-exchange rights," it can be justly regarded in today's economic and political situation as a landmark on the way towards creating a friendlier environment for hard-currency dealings on Soviet territory. And there is one more important detail: the law added no weight to the restrictive and prohibitive tendencies of the earlier-adopted presidential decree on the special uses of hard currency reserves in 1991.

The general impression is that the legislative achievements of February and March 1991 offer a glimmer of hope that the widely-expected unpopular measures aimed at stabilizing the financial situation in the country will not interfere with the ongoing drive for transition to a market economy.

Agricultural

CPSU's Stroyev on New Price Policy 'Disaster'
*LD1804095891 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 0750 GMT 18 Apr 91*

[Text] Moscow, 18 Apr (TASS)—The main suppliers of food in the Soviet Union are still the collective and state

farms, writes Yegor Stroyev, CPSU Central Committee Politburo member and secretary responsible for its agrarian sector, in the sociopolitical weekly GLASNOST today. Therefore, what will enable the food difficulties to be overcome is not their economic ruin but all-around support for them: the mastering of leasehold and share-based relations, cooperatives, use of the potential of peasant farms and private households, and broad integration of new forms of management of public production.

The main thing is not to permit a fall in agricultural production, to maintain the sown areas at the level of last year, and, where possible, increase them. But this means that the peasants should feel the real help of all society. At the same time Yegor Stroyev put in a reminder that this spring the volume of field work has increased. It increased by nearly a quarter above normal. Moreover, owing to the general disorder in the economy there was a sharp fall in deliveries of equipment, mineral fertilizers, pesticides, spares, fuels and lubricants, and so on to the rural areas. In the past year alone these areas had a shortfall of 7 billion rubles worth of deliveries. And this was under conditions in which many technical operations were still being done by hand. A good half of agricultural production's active manpower was engaged in these operations.

But perhaps the new price policy has turned out to be the greatest disaster for the countryside. Owing to violation of the parity of prices and nonequivalence of exchange with the towns, practically all the accumulations were being removed from the rural economy. On a number of farms difficulties with wage payments have already arisen.

This approach has nothing in common with the party's agrarian policy, the secretary of the CPSU Central Committee reminds us. By decree of the USSR president of 8 April, the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, the relevant ministries and departments, and local bodies are instructed, within a month to correct the situation and ease the extreme situation that has taken shape in the agrarian complex, and mobilize all available potential for the earliest high-quality implementation of spring field work.

Paper on Early Apr Weather, Crop Conditions

914B0138A Moscow SELSKAYA ZHIZN
in Russian 17 Apr 91 p 2

[Report by T. Ivashneva, agricultural meteorologist: "The Weather and Crops"]

[Text] Unusually warm and primarily dry weather continued to dominate over the European part of the country. The snow cover was melting quickly off the fields, and by 10 April its southerly border was the Petrozavodsk—Vologda—Yoshkar-Ola—Orenburg line. North of the indicated line the winter grain crops were in a state of winter dormancy.

Over the majority of the territory of the Northern Region and in the north of the Volga-Vyatka and Urals regions,

where the thickness of the snow cover was great (25-45 cm), conditions were preserved for damage to winter grain crops and perennial grasses. By the end of the 10-day period, regeneration of vegetation of winter crops was noted in the Baltics area, Belorussia, the Central-Chernozem region, and over the majority of the Central region and the Central Volga area.

In more southerly regions winter rye and wheat were tillering, and in Moldova, the southwestern Ukraine, and over the majority of the Northern Caucasus region these same crops were noted to be in the stem extension stage. The development of winter grain crops is ahead of the average annual development by five to 10 days.

In the majority of the rayons of Belorussia, the Baltics, the Central-Chernozem region, and the Central Volga area, warm weather contributed to further warming and drying of the upper layer of the soil. To the south of the Riga—Mogilev—Voronezh—Saratov line the upper layer of soil achieved a state of soft pliability five to seven days earlier than the annual average. The temperature of the soil at a depth of 10 cm was seven to nine degrees. This presented favorable conditions there for conducting spring field work and sowing early spring grain and fodder crops. In the southern rayons of the Ukraine, Moldova, and the Northern Caucasus the soil warmed to 10-11 degrees and the optimal time period for the sowing of warm-weather crops set in.

In the republics of the Transcaucasus region the weather was warm. Winter crops were in the stem extension stage. The apple trees, cherries, and plums were developing their first leaves, and the early varieties of apricots, peaches, and cherries began to blossom one to two weeks earlier than the annual average.

In the majority of the agricultural regions of Western Siberia and Northern Kazakhstan the weather was warmer than usual. Only in southern Altay Kray and the adjoining rayons of Kazakhstan did it cool down at the end of the ten-day period. Conditions for the completion of the wintering of the crops were satisfactory.

In the republics of Central Asia the air warmed to 20-28 degrees during daytime hours and to 32 degrees in places in Uzbekistan and southern Turkmenia. The sowing of early spring grain, fodder, and vegetable crops continued. The sowing of cotton began.

Military

Yazov Examines Issue of Housing for Servicemen

PM1804103991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 13 Apr 91 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed account of USSR Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov's reply to question from USSR People's Deputies S. Shuvalov and Yu. Sokolova under "Our Digest" rubric: "What Is Said, What Is Written..."]

[Text] From the reply given by USSR Defense Minister Marshal of the Soviet Union D. Yazov to a question from USSR People's Deputies S. Shuvalov and Yu. Sokolova:

"In reply to your question about the measures being taken in the USSR Defense Ministry to provide housing for families of servicemen in the Baltic Military District, I have the following to report:

"At the present time the problem of providing housing for servicemen and members of their families in the Baltic republics is extremely urgent, since the number of servicemen without apartments in this region now stands at over 9,000 families.

"A solution to the housing problem in the Baltic republics is adversely affected by the discriminatory measures taken by republic and local organs of power against servicemen, the difficulties in obtaining permits to construct apartment blocks and in reoccupying space that has become vacant, and the refusal to accept funds for shared participation in housing construction and paying off debts in the allocation of housing constructed with USSR Defense Ministry money (44,000 square meters in Latvia, 38,000 in Lithuania, and 21,000 in Estonia) in accordance with the USSR government resolution.

"In view of this, beginning in 1991, the USSR Defense Ministry has decided to construct housing for discharged servicemen and persons subject to resettlement from closed military camps in other regions of the country (Leningrad, Pskov, Novgorod, and other oblasts) with the intention of using the vacated housing stock to provide for servicemen without apartments. At the same time the construction of housing on the territory of the Baltic Military District will be continued with the aid of USSR Defense Ministry contract organizations. Between 1991 and 1995 the construction of apartment blocks with a total area of 575,000 square meters is planned.

"At the same time it should be noted that the housing problem continues to remain acute throughout the USSR Defense Ministry as a whole. Because of the withdrawal of troops from East Europe and Mongolia, the number of servicemen without apartments in the USSR Defense Ministry is not going down but is on the increase and at the present time exceeds 192,000 families...

"It is obvious that it is impossible to fulfill the increased housing program without the active participation and help of the union republics. However, the union republics do not always fulfill government documents regarding questions of providing servicemen with housing, difficulties are created at local level over the allocation of plots of land, exorbitant demands are made over the question of participation in developing the infrastructure of cities and settlements, and the necessary amounts of money for the construction of apartment blocks on a shared participation basis are not accepted. Thus, according to the plan for 1991, only

890,000 of the 1,350,000 square meters that have been applied for have been accepted by local soviet ispolkoms [executive committees].

"Local organs of power are not fulfilling pledges to return housing constructed with money handed over for shared participation (the debt stands at more than 735,000 square meters; including 390,000 square meters in the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic], 87,000 in the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], and 65,000 in the Uzbek SSR). Moreover, according to the USSR Government resolution, the debt exceeds a total area of 1,315,000 square meters..."

(At the request of the deputies the answer was circulated at the USSR Supreme Soviet.)

Arms Quality, Not Quantity, Termed Preeminent

PM1804092191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
11 Apr 91 Second Edition p 4

["My Opinion" article by political observer Gennadiy Vasilyev: "Smarter Than Two Generals?"]

[Text] Both "Desert Shield" and "Desert Storm" are behind us, but the analysis of what happened in and around the Gulf goes on. Politicians, academics, military men, and engineers will be investigating for some time to come just how this most acute international crisis, which turned into a quite short-lived but brutal war, came about. They are doing so to draw conclusions for the future, and an important aspect of this analysis, which has attracted the close attention of the Western press, is the military-technical aspect.

I have already said that the Gulf was a vast testing range where weapons—both new weapons which had never been used in action, and old weapons which had been mothballed and reequipped—were tested in a "live fire" situation. Certain results of these tests are obvious. The Gulf war was a triumph for state-of-the-art weapons packed with electronics, such as the "all-seeing bombs" and the Patriot missile interceptors. At the same time, it called the effectiveness of tanks into question, particularly in the situation in which the Iraqi armored troops found themselves—deprived of air cover or intelligence data from space.

In the United States the results of the war in the Near and Middle East are already having a tangible impact on the practical activity of the Pentagon and arms companies. Congress has received a request for additional funds to be allocated for 500 Patriot missiles, although fewer than 200 were fired in the Gulf. U.S. Defense Secretary R. Cheney is trying to increase the SDI budget in the next fiscal year by 60 percent to \$4.6 billion. It is not just a question of requests for additional funding, however. All the more so as the U.S. Administration clearly does not want to inflate the military budget to the detriment of civilian sectors of production. A major reassessment of strategic installations and of the composition and equipping of the Armed Forces is under way.

It began in connection with the end of the "cold war" and the rapid pace of events in the Gulf.

Quoting President Bush's statement that the country needs a "restructuring" of its Armed Forces, *FORTUNE* magazine—the organ of business circles—explained: "His aim is to make the U.S. arsenal smaller, 'smarter,' faster, and stronger." "In order to achieve this," the magazine concludes, "the military industry and the government should sharply change their business relationship. This process is already under way."

In short, the Pentagon's "restructuring" consists of winding up production of many weapons that may not be that old but belong to the past, and switching to the production of state-of-the-art weapons which, as *FORTUNE* put it, will be "smarter than Generals Colin Powell and Norman Schwarzkopf put together." (Colin Powell is chairman of the U.S. Joint Chiefs, and Norman Schwarzkopf was the allied commander in the Gulf.) These plans are already being implemented. Production of such "stars" of the Gulf War as the M-1 Abrams tank, the Apache helicopter, and the F-15 Eagle fighter is already ending. Work is already under way on the "military toys of the 21st century"—stealth-technology cruise missiles, guided glide bombs, and so forth.

So what about military spending, any increase in which—as many people in the United States recognize—undermines the fundamental basis of the country's might and its economic position in the world? The solution, in the analysts' opinion, is not so much to engage in mass production of arms as to focus on research and development work with a wide sphere of

applications. To create sensor homing instruments, to develop new engines, to improve wing design—in short, to develop innovations which could have applications for various kinds of arms.

I believe that all this is of paramount importance for us too. The first conclusion I feel we should draw is that it is not the quantity now but the quality of arms and armed forces which is becoming a decisive factor in a country's defensive might. This is directly bound up with a society's scientific, technical, economic, and even domestic conditions. It is impossible to expect success in a competition when many schools offer computer training only by correspondence course or when you cannot even find a photocopier in many newspaper offices.

The second conclusion concerns the efforts being made by mankind to curb the arms race. There have already been considerable achievements along this road. New agreements are in the pipeline which will lay the foundations for the elimination of a considerable number of the colossal arsenals of death that have already been built up. These agreements primarily concern the quantitative side of things; a certain number of missiles, tanks, and artillery pieces are to be destroyed. At the same time, the qualitative arms race is picking up speed. I realize that it is impossible to halt scientific and technical progress, but we need to put barriers in the way of using the fruits of human reason for the purpose of murder and destruction. Unless we want "smart" bombs and missiles to outwit people and mankind's progress, begun with such difficulty, toward a more civilized and safer world to be undermined.

Baltic Republics

Baltic Residents Urge Extraordinary Congress

LD1004022691 Moscow TASS in English 2042 GMT
9 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent]

[Text] Tallinn April 9 TASS—Residents in the Baltics, who advocate keeping the Baltic republics within the Soviet Union, have called for the convocation of an extraordinary Congress of USSR People's Deputies with the only item on the agenda "On Measures to Act on the Strength of the Results of the March 17, 1991, Referendum".

Sergey Petinov, a deputy to the Estonian Parliament, on Monday acquainted TASS with a statement to this effect by the Council of the Baltic Republics and by members of the "Daugavpils Initiative" Movement. Petinov was one of those who signed the statement.

About 1.5 million people in the Baltic republics alone voted in favour of preserving the USSR. They did so at a time when Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia declined to hold the All-Union referendum, Petinov noted.

He believes that the results of the referendum are mandatory for carrying out the will of the peoples of the USSR by all state power and administration bodies throughout the territory of the Soviet Union.

Surprising Novodvorskaya Remarks Cited

PM1804142591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 15 Apr 91 First Edition p 3

["Direct Line" report by Colonel M. Ziyeminsh: "V. Novodvorskaya Gives Advice on 'How We Should Live Now'"]

[Text] Riga—The notorious Valeriya Novodvorskaya recently visited Riga at the invitation of the Democratic Union of Latvia. The purpose and the program of the "visit" remained unknown to the public at large. In general it would possibly have taken place in strict secrecy had not the local press deemed it necessary, at least retrospectively, to feature it in its pages. So what did the notorious V. Novodvorskaya talk about in Latvia?

First and foremost was, of course, the same old question of "the Baltic region's future independence." "You must create such conditions for the occupiers," Novodvorskaya exhorts her cohorts in Latvia, that they know that "they will have to pay for every murder with a blown-up tank. You must not construct kindergartens for them, but you must stop supplying military facilities with electric power, water, and food and stop the activities of union enterprises. Let them live on what is dropped from helicopters for them."

Regarding the opinion of "the occupiers living in Latvia," in Novodvorskaya's words, there is no need whatsoever to take account of this opinion because "these occupiers' motherland is not Latvia at all, but a tank." These statements surprised even some local extremists.

Sajudis Calls for 'Vigil' at Supreme Council

LD1804202691 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian
1900 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] People of Lithuania, clouds of danger are once again gathering over Lithuania. General Varennikov is driving around in Vilnius, the Kremlin is threatening the Lithuanian banks and border services with ultimatums, the Soviet Army is controlled by nobody, Soviet servicemen have intensified their movements, the OMON [Special Purpose Militia Detachment] is rampant.

Similar news has been received from Riga, and all this is happening, as usual, when Gorbachev is abroad.

Yesterday it was decided at a meeting of representatives of the Lithuanian Sajudis to strengthen the vigil this weekend at the Supreme Council building. People of Lithuania, we ask you to come to keep a vigil at the Supreme Council building. On Saturday, at 1700 hours [local time], the Mazeikiai parish choir members will perform there.

[Signed] The Council of Lithuanian Sajudis Seimas.

Issues Appeal

LD1904100191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian
2000 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Appeal issued by the Lithuanian Sajudis to the people of Lithuania; date not given]

Lithuanian CPSU members continue to have their property seized. We seem helpless. We cannot regain the seized buildings, and cannot put on trial the organizers of the bloody January events. What can we do?

We can lower our hands and reconcile ourselves with the fact that the Lithuanian property is being plundered, and that the murderers are walking among us. We, believing in our weakness, will not be able to shake off [words indistinct].

But there is another way. We can show our resolute intolerance toward the creeping occupation, toward our despair, indifference, and helplessness, as is symbolized by our permanent pickets at the state radio and television building, and at the CPSU Central Committee building.

But the support of us all is essential. Where are the workers of the television and the press? Where are the parities and movements, deputies of local government

and of the Supreme Council? Where are our protest actions? Have we become disillusioned? Are we lacking strength?

Let us prove that this is not so, that we are strong in our will and determination.

We invite you to come tomorrow, at 1330, to Savivaldybės Square, to learn about the hunger strikers.

Economic Destabilizing Program in Lithuania Noted

LD1804222991 Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 18 April

[Text] By the information of the Lithuanian state newspaper LIETUVOS AIDAS, last summer Moscow began working out a program of destabilizing the economy of the Republic of Lithuania. Engaged in the program was a group of experts in economics, assisted by a few officials of the Lithuanian branch of the Soviet Communist Party. The LIETUVOS AIDAS daily claims that the group was headed by Yuriy Maslyukov, the Soviet vice premier and member of the Communist Party's Politburo.

Without naming the source of information, the LIETUVOS AIDAS daily writes that at the beginning of this year work on the program for destabilizing Lithuania's economy was completed, and the project was approved by the top officials of the Soviet Union.

The key role in the implementation of the destabilization program is given to the Lithuanian division of the Soviet Communist Party, to Lithuanian enterprises under Soviet jurisdiction, and to collective and state farms. The goal of the program is to give an economic footing for alternative structures of power set up on the basis of the Communist Party and to create such conditions under which all attempts by the Lithuanian Government to decolonize and privatize Lithuania's economy would only deepen the crisis.

After the program was approved, all the ministries of the Soviet Union were issued orders to coordinate their actions with the leadership of the pro-Kremlin communists in Lithuania. The latter spared no efforts to save collective farms from disbanding; they promised to provide collective farms with agricultural machines, fodder, and seeds from the Soviet Union.

Landsbergis Addresses Supreme Soviet 28 Mar

PM1104154991 Vilnius EKHO LITVY in Russian 30 Mar 91 p 1

[ELTA report: "At the Republic Supreme Soviet Session"]

[Text] The third session of the Supreme Soviet continued its work 28 March. Vytautas Landsbergis informed the Supreme Soviet of certain aspects of Lithuania's international policy. He noted that in recent months the Soviet Union has mounted an extensive

propaganda campaign in Western states whose aim has been to neutralize the very negative impression of the Soviet Union's policy which had formed as a result of the January events and to try and make up for M. Gorbachev's shaken prestige in the West. Our representatives who have worked in Western countries in the past or are working there now, Landsbergis noted, can confirm the improvements and progress made in establishing Lithuania on international platforms, on one hand, and the extremely sophisticated methods of contradicting this on the part of Soviet diplomacy, on the other.

The chairman noted that events in the Soviet Union itself are unfolding very dynamically. This can be clearly seen in the progress of the Third Extraordinary Congress of Russian Federation People's Deputies, which began today. It can be expected that the congress will be held in the spirit of Russia's consolidation and the defense of Russia's sovereignty. Our policy in the East will also depend to a great extent on this.

Speaking about our situation in international politics, V. Landsbergis noted that certain changes can be observed there. For example, the leaders of Great Britain and the United States are beginning to specially single out the Baltic states as the object of their attention.

Speaking about the possibilities of holding talks between Lithuania and the Soviet Union, V. Landsbergis noted that at the moment we are living in an atmosphere of coercion, pressure, and intimidation, and we are coming up against a desire to avoid somehow determining the procedure for holding talks. The chairman commented on certain false interpretations of our position on holding talks circulated by TASS.

In conclusion V. Landsbergis noted that next month might be full of tension and dangers connected both with the situation and the processes going on in the Soviet Union itself and with ventures in Lithuania that the former authorities have not yet given up. However, the chairman said, I would like to express the conviction that you cannot reverse the wheel of history.

The deputies heard a report by Algirdas Saudargas, Lithuanian foreign minister, on his activity during his long official trip abroad.

Then the discussion of the draft Law on the Republic Budget started. Audrius Rudis, chairman of the Budget Commission, read a report.

Gediminas Vagnorius, republic prime minister, spoke on this question.

RSFSR

Yeltsin Meets UN Secretary Perez De Cuellar

*PM1804140191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Apr 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Report from IZVESTIYA, URAL-SOVETY, POST-FACTUM, INTERFAX, TASS, REUTER roundup: "B.N. Yeltsin's Pronouncements"]

[Text] At the end of his visit to Strasbourg B.N. Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, met with UN Secretary General Javier Perez de Cuellar.

In the course of their addresses to groups of members of the European Parliament Yeltsin noted that Russia's declaration of sovereignty signifies the conduct of an independent foreign policy that will be coordinated in the main with the Union's foreign policy activity. The RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman stressed that Russia does not intend to secede from the USSR—in fact it will contribute to the unification of the republics and the conclusion of a new Union treaty. Answering a question about the democratization processes in the USSR, Yeltsin advocated progress "along the path that is being followed by the civilized countries of the world." This presupposes full observance of human rights, equality for all forms of ownership, including private ownership, the gradual transition to market relations in the economy, and the implementation of effective social protection of the population.

Yeltsin said that the RSFSR intends to seek membership of the United Nations and other international organizations. While urging European integration, Yeltsin proposed the creation of a "community" embracing the European Continent and the entire Russian Federation. We are contemplating the idea of a unified Eurasian space, he said. "Integration should not stop at the Urals."

French Spokesman on Meeting

*LD1804192791 Moscow TASS in English 1847 GMT
18 Apr 91*

[By TASS correspondent Svetlana Portnova]

[Text] Paris April 18 TASS—Chairman of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin met here Jean-Louis Bianco, secretary general of the French president's office. On this occasion he had an opportunity to welcome French President Francois Mitterrand and exchange a few words with him, Hubert Vedrine, official representative of the president, said in an interview with the fifth programme of French television.

He pointed out that Yeltsin was representing Russia and in this capacity he was received in the presidential palace. However, all problems dealing with the Soviet Union will be discussed only with the president of that

country. As for the integration of Russia into the European Community, mentioned by the head of the Russian parliament, Vedrine said that it was a correct course.

'Vremya' Reports Meeting

*LD1804204291 Moscow Central Television Vostok
Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1800 GMT
18 Apr 91*

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Boris Yeltsin's visit to France has been capped off by a meeting with President Francois Mitterrand. After visiting the [presidential] palace, Russia's leader said that the meeting was quite varied in character. The prospects of Russia entering into the European home were discussed, as were the internal problems of the Soviet Union.

Mitterrand was informed that Russia has its state sovereignty, and that it is carrying out and will continue to carry out its own independent foreign policy.

Colonel Alksnis: Yeltsin 'Destroying Russia'

*PM1804123991 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 18 Apr 91 First Edition p 1*

[Extract from interview with USSR People's Deputy Colonel V. Alksnis by journalist A. Nevzorov (Leningrad Television); date and place of interview not given; under general heading: "Our Digest; What Is Being Said and Written...."]

[Text] [Alksnis] ...I cannot take a positive view of Yeltsin. Boris Nikolayevich is trying to grab power. What he is doing today, and what his allies are doing today is terrible, and it is terrible primarily for Russia. They are ruining Russia, they are destroying Russia.

[Nevzorov] How dangerous is he for the country as a whole?

[Alksnis] The point is that Boris Nikolayevich, and those who are behind him, are copying in their entirety the tactics employed by the Bolsheviks in 1917. You will recall that in 1917 the Bolshevik Party favored Russia's defeat in World War I, favored the disintegration of the Russian empire.... They favored the disintegration of everything. They appealed to the mob, they actively influenced the mob. Today we see how all this is being repeated by the neo-Democrats, using the tactics of neo-Bolshevism.

Supreme Soviet Passes Militia Law 18 Apr

*LD1804221491 Moscow TASS in English 2149 GMT
18 Apr 91*

[By TASS correspondents Boris Zverev, Yuriy Kozmin, and Andrey Surzhanskiy]

[Text] Moscow April 19 TASS—The Russian parliament spent about the whole of the Thursday session discussing after second reading the blueprint of the Russian law on militia. Despite the fact that at the beginning of the session some legislators tried to include other issues in the agenda and impose a general political discussion, the parliament managed to pass over to the constructive work rather quickly and finish the discussion of all amendments (a total of 80 pages) to this document.

The Russian law, adopted on Thursday, is one of the first legal acts, aimed at reforming the judicial system of the republic. It tackles a number of important problems, specifically, the depolitization of the Russian law-enforcement agencies. "The creation and activities of political parties and organizations are not permitted in militia. Militia officers cannot be guided in their work by resolutions of political parties and massive public movements pursuing political goals," the document said.

The legislators adopted a resolution envisaging the putting into effect of the law on militia on the day of its publication. It has been assigned to the Russian Council of Ministers to transfer in 1991-1992 to other institutions the functions, of which the militia has been relieved, specifically the issuing of passports, passes and permits to enter a border zone, the registration of foreign citizens and people without citizenship, who come to the Russian Federation, the preparation of documents and permits to enter the USSR and go abroad.

'Centrist Bloc' Nominates Voronin for Presidency

LD1804185891 Moscow TASS in English 1838 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—The meeting of the Centrist Bloc of political parties and movements today nominated its Chairman Vladimir Voronin as candidate for the presidency of the Russian Federation.

Previously, president of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin and chairman of the USSR Liberal Democratic Party Vladimir Zhirinovskiy were slated for this post.

Tatarstan Postpones Presidential Election

LD1804041691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1236 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Kazan, 17 Apr (TASS)—The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Tatarstan by a majority vote has declined a suggestion to conduct an election of the president of the republic. Mintimer Shaimiyev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of Tatarstan, stated that the law on the presidency should be elaborated first. It was decided to form the appropriate commission and return to this question at the next session in May this year. Meanwhile, amendments and additions were introduced to the Constitution of the republic. One of its articles now says: "The president of the Tatarskaya Soviet Socialist Republic is the highest official figure of the Tatarskaya Soviet Socialist Republic."

Nizhniy Tagil Voices No Confidence in Gorbachev

PM1804140791 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 18 Apr 91 First Edition p 2

[Telegram from M. Kobozev, secretary of Nizhniy Tagil City CPSU Committee: "Telegram to This Issue"]

[Text] The economic situation in the city of Nizhniy Tagil has recently deteriorated drastically. The Nizhniy Tagil Metallurgical Combine named for V.I. Lenin is working at no more than one third of its capacity because of the coal shortage, and the supply of metal to the Urals Railroad Car Plant, boiler and radiator, cement, and other plants has almost ceased. Today thousands of people are already not working and future prospects in this matter are even gloomier. A meeting of the party and economic aktiv 11 April 1991 resolved:

1. To consider the situation which has arisen in the city as being in dire need of urgent and extreme measures;

2. To demand that the USSR president, the USSR and RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviets, and the Union and republic governments take measures within 10 days to guarantee coal supplies to metallurgical workers at the level necessary for the normal operation of the metallurgical combine and other enterprises in the city;

3. While supporting the miners' demands to create an interrepublic commission and for the "roundtable" to begin work, to call on them to end their strike, which has brought the country's economy to the brink of collapse;

4. To express no confidence in Comrade M.S. Gorbachev as general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee and to demand that an extraordinary party congress be convened to resolve the leadership question and that of drawing up a program of action commensurate with the situation.

[Signed] CPSU Gorkom [city committee] Secretary M. Kobozev.

Gorbachev Criticized at Leningrad Plenum

PM1804134391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 16 Apr 91 First Edition p 2

[Correspondent A. Molokov report: "There Must Be No Delay; Notes from the Leningrad CPSU Obkom Plenum"]

[Text] ...They dispersed after 2100 hours. Some with relief, some with annoyance. Some believed that they had kept the obkom [oblast party committee] members from ill thought-out, categorical decisions, others did not conceal their disenchantment—What is the point of this plenum anyway, they said: just to let off steam once again?!

There were grounds for these opposed perceptions. Party committee secretaries had demanded the convening of

such a plenum. It is here, at raykom [rayon party committee] and factory party committee level, that the anxiety of Communists at the development of the situation in the country and the party is being voiced increasingly loudly. It is here, where the interests of the party masses determine the mood of CPSU committees, that dissatisfaction with the position occupied by the party leadership has built up and grown. At the same time, some extremely influential members of the obkom bureau believed that it was too early to hold such a plenum, or that it was not necessary to hold it at all. And it was postponed repeatedly. It is possible that it would not have been convened this time either, if it had not been for the sharp deterioration in the sociopolitical situation caused by the price rises of 2 April, when it became clear to everyone that the party is hostage to the situation and that to all intents and purposes it is being sacrificed to the very state and governmental course which is being implemented in its name.

I do not rule out that even in these circumstances some of the obkom leaders at the plenum really intended only to "let off steam" and give people the opportunity to have their say. But the other side was also prepared, as shown by the draft main document putting forward the demand for an urgent Central Committee plenum.

Essentially, it was again a clash between two lines, two approaches. Although there were no unexpected changes in the disposition of forces at this plenum, nevertheless it reflected the growth of the struggle—political and ideological—inside the Leningrad CPSU organization and the party as a whole.

"The crisis that has overwhelmed the country has now reached its zenith. An economic crisis in which the national economy is collapsing literally before our very eyes, and the most valuable commodity—human labor—is being devalued. A political crisis in which even emergency powers are incapable of averting the paralysis of power, the anarchy of laws, and the war of sovereignties." That is how B. Gidasov, first secretary of the CPSU Obkom, described the situation in his report. "Surely it was not this that Communists were advocating when they supported the policy of renewal in April 1985? What has perestroika given, and to whom? Who is to blame for the escalating crisis? The party must have an answer to these questions today." However, Boris Veniaminovich saw the reason why "the country was dragged into an experiment of unprecedented proportions"—the essence of which is expressed in the well known formula: Movement is everything, the final goal counts for nothing—as lying "in the unforgivable passiveness and inconsistency of the CPSU leadership and of the USSR president personally." He called his attempt to occupy a centrist position a failure as well. The president's line of temporizing and of half-measures was assessed as inability to control the situation. The people no longer understand what the difference is between Gorbachev and Yeltsin and between the allegedly alternative courses personified by these two leaders.

"We cannot continue a policy that is incomprehensible for us, and even more so for the party masses and the working people. Similarly, we are not going to continue to tolerate the party being debarred from elaborating the political course that the highest leaders of the CPSU are implementing today in its name, but without any consultation with Communists," V. Gidasov stated.

But he had already proposed in his report that the question "of the responsibility of the Communist leaders of the party and the state for the elaboration and implementation of an anticrisis program" be examined at the next CPSU Central Committee Plenum. Many of those participating in the plenum assessed this as an attempt at yet another compromise, a desire merely to retouch the policy implemented by the "elite."

"For several years now they have been telling us that we are on the right road. But if the road which has brought into many state structures the incompetent and lumpenized section of our society, and frequently the criminal element as well, the road of the economic collapse, anarchy, and the open flouting of laws, the road that has brought to power in several republics forces which do not even hide the nationalistic direction of their policies with their frankly brown [fascist] tinge, the road leading to the elimination of socialism and of our statehood is the right road, then we are all simply lunatics, without realizing it," V. Borisov, first secretary of Krasogvardeyskiy CPSU Raykom, said in his speech.

"I do not agree with the thesis that the party has been pushed aside from the process of elaborating the political course and, to be more precise, state policy," Yu. Denisov, rector of Leningrad Institute of Political Science, stated. "But alas, the state policy which is being implemented is rooted in the decisions of the 28th party congress, which is something like the Bible. Justification can be found in them for absolutely any twist in political course. The congress was unable to get to the roots of the party's crisis. The preservation of a bogus unity between differently oriented forces in the CPSU is leading to the paralysis of its political will and ideological development. It is no use our continually alluding to the fact that the general secretary does not express Communists' interests; he actually expresses them perfectly, and consequently manages to be all things to all men." The speaker saw only one way out here—the faster elaboration of the party program and its immediate adoption.

Yu. Barygin, a metalworker and fitter at the "Arsenal" Association, N. Karvonen, deputy secretary of the "Izhorskiy Zavod" Association Party Committee, and V. Mikhalev, department chief at the "Signal" Association, voiced criticism of V. Gidasov's report and aims. Communists in primary organizations, they said, no longer trust the party leadership. The people also have no belief in any of Mikhail Sergeyevich's initiatives. "In six years all his good intentions have led to the collapse of our state. The new course, if one is formulated, will need new people also."

The opposite point of view was expressed most fully in the speech of V. Kalashnikov, member of the CPSU Obkom Bureau. "I support the proposal for the urgent convening of a Central Committee plenum, provided that it is devoted to elaborating and discussing the CPSU's anticrisis policy, and not to attempts to implement the proposal for the replacement of the party leadership," Vladimir Valeryanovich said. "A change in party leadership at the present time will be unequivocally interpreted both in the party itself and in society at large as a victory for the conservative forces. When people say today that many Communists in Leningrad criticize Gorbachev, the fact cannot be ignored that they criticize him from different positions: some for the fact that he is allegedly retreating from perestroika's socialist guidelines and leading us purposefully toward capitalism; others for inconsistency in implementing the course of switching to a market economy and rule-of-law state." "I am sure that the majority of Leningrad's Communists espouse the decisions of the 28th congress and would not support an attempt to revise the chosen course. I am sure too that the majority of Leningrad's Communists would not support an attempt to replace the party leadership at the present time," Kalashnikov stressed.

This opinion was supported by Professor A. Denisov, member of the obkom bureau and member of the USSR Supreme Soviet. "The course we adopted at the 28th congress remains the same. It is possible to criticize it, but this is no reason to call people to account just because the course does not suit us. We must get down to fulfilling the president's anticrisis program. We can be patient until the fall; nothing terrible will happen. And that is when we can raise the question of a conference, a congress, and the general secretary."

"When they tell us: In the fall there will be an extraordinary or maybe a routine conference where we should discuss a new party program and define our position, then I ask myself the question: Will the USSR survive until the fall unless we stop its disintegration within the next two months?" Yu. Belov, secretary of the CPSU Obkom, objected. "We must save the state. Then we will have time to quarrel, clarify, and go our separate ways." Yu. Belov saw the cause of the rapid growth of destructive processes in society primarily in the fact that a fundamental mistake was made at the 28th congress: "In our political assessments and in determining our course we rejected the social class method of cognition of social life and social phenomena.... And the policy of pseudo-centrism that the general secretary is pursuing has cleared the way for anticommunist forces."

"A step to the right or a step to the left is classed as an escape attempt..."—this phrase was heard in the Gulag era. But I experienced roughly the same feeling at this Leningrad CPSU Obkom Plenum. It seemed that those who attended it were afraid to step either to the right or to the left. The situation was not clarified until literally the last moment. The draft resolution proposed by the organizers was rejected even as a basis for discussion. A

battle was also waged virtually over every phrase and every paragraph in the second document—the plenum's appeal to the Central Committee and the country's party organizations.

Understanding came later: The plenum moved the Leningrad party organization another step forward—toward rapprochement with the working people and toward overcoming the alienation of the party masses from participation in the political decisionmaking process. After all, it was the last factor that has led to the situation where the course of perestroika, which engendered great social expectations, finds itself in the power of forces trying to lend a directly opposite meaning to it.

Expert Panel Discusses RSFSR Ethnic Issues

PM1804120991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 13 Apr 91 First Edition p 2

[Unattributed report: "Discussed by Expert Council"]

[Text] The first sitting of the Expert Council on Problems of Interethnic Relations, comprising specialists with various political views, has been held at the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Communist Party Central Committee.

The gathering discussed pressing problems of interethnic relations within the Russian Federation.

Scientists consider most important the defense of citizens' ethnic rights and the reality of every people's right to determine their own political status, eliminate interethnic conflicts, and restore the dignity and rights of peoples subjected to repression during the years of Stalinism.

During the scientific discussion an attempt was made to outline the means of resolving these problems and to determine the most urgent tasks facing society, the state, and, in particular, Russian legislator.

I.I. Antonovich, member of the Politburo and secretary of the RSFSR Communist Party Central Committee, took part in and spoke at the sitting.

RSFSR Emergency Powers Debate Viewed

PM1104140991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 5 Apr 91 p 1

[Commentary by I. Sichka and A. Pankratov: "Yeltsin Goes For Broke"]

[Text] The conclusions of many observers that the Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputies is virtually over and its basic conclusions are clear turned out to be premature. Yesterday Boris Yeltsin made a political statement which eclipsed all the preceding events at the congress.

After the deputies had adopted in its entirety the resolution "On the Political and Socioeconomic Situation in the RSFSR and Measures To Overcome the Crisis," Boris Nikolayevich described it as "extremely important," but warned: "The situation in the country now is such that it may put the practicability of the decisions that have just been adopted into doubt." He proposed that the congress adopt a further resolution:

1. To instruct the Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, and also the chairman of the Supreme Soviet to implement urgent measures, including emergency measures, to get society out of the crisis situation and avert, suspend, and stop strikes.

In the process of realizing the anticrisis powers:

The Supreme Soviet is entitled to issue laws on questions designated as under the jurisdiction of the Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies (apart from adopting a Constitution and electing leaders of state organs defined by the RSFSR Constitution), submitting these laws subsequently to be ratified by a Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies:

The chairman of the Supreme Soviet is entitled to issue directions whose implementation shall be compulsory on RSFSR territory.

Decisions of the Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet which provide for the introduction of measures of an emergency character on individual territories of the RSFSR may be adopted with the agreement of the supreme organs of state power of the republics which are part of the RSFSR and the soviets of people's deputies of the relevant territories.

2. The powers of the Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the chairman of the Supreme Soviet indicated in Clause 1 cannot be used to dissolve legally elected organs of state power or to change the national-state structure of the RSFSR.

The Congress of People's Deputies reserves the right to change or repeal any decision adopted by the Supreme Soviet, the Supreme Soviet Presidium, or the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

At the same time Boris Nikolayevich deemed it necessary to draw attention to the point that in the given case the congress is not overstepping the bounds of the RSFSR Constitution, since it is not increasing the aggregate powers of the republics' supreme organs of power. It was a question only of redistributing these powers. In effect this means that during a vote a decision no longer requires two-thirds of the votes, but only a simple majority. However, the congress can interpret otherwise.... In addition, the redistribution of power is of a temporary nature and ceases automatically after the election of the RSFSR president.

So, then, additional powers. There has already been a similar situation, when USSR President M. Gorbachev

requested additional powers for himself. Then many democrats voted "against." Today this is being held against them: You are demanding for "your own people" what you refused your opponents.

However, for the sake of objectivity, it is worth noting at least three circumstances which distinguish M. Gorbachev's "request" from B. Yeltsin's "request." Mikhail Sergeyevich was already president and already had extensive powers by that time.

Second In both cases a system of checks and balances is envisaged in the shape of congresses, supreme soviets, and their presidiums. But Yeltsin—I think any impartial observer would agree with this—is in tougher opposition "pincers" than Mikhail Sergeyevich.

Finally, the "request" for powers for Yeltsin is taking place in the context of a significantly worse economic and political situation in Russia. The miners' strike threatens to spread any day to adjacent sectors and paralyze the entire economy. Many deputies believe that the one man whom the miners may still take at his word and immediately call off their strike is Yeltsin. During the congress his political opponents proposed more than once that Yeltsin appeal to the miners and, making use of his prestige, call on them to halt their strike. But....

But Boris Nikolayevich replied: I cannot simply make promises in this way. Give me the corresponding powers, and it is a different story.... Obviously it was this idea, voiced a few days ago, which prompted him to make yesterday's statement. It came unexpectedly for both democrats and the "Communists of Russia" bloc alike.

The presidential elections in Russia involve a time factor. For several months more Yeltsin will have to remain the butt of criticism from the opposition, a "whipping boy" forbidden to take any decisive measures at all; that means a slow but inexorable decline in prestige, a drop in political rating. That means he must take a risk; he must act.

On the other hand, Yeltsin is insuring himself for the future. In the event that the powers are refused, he will have the right after a certain time to say: I wanted to do something, but you would not let me.

Most likely he is taking a sound risk now. In the event that he is refused additional powers, the option of offering his resignation is, as far as I know, being discussed by the narrow circle of his intimates.

To grant the powers is also a risk. In effect, Russia gets the opportunity of "trying out" Yeltsin over several months on the subject of suitability for the presidency. If he is unable to do anything or prove himself within this time, that means political death, period.

What has happened precisely? The chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet has issued a declaration by way of a legislative initiative—the congress has been invited to decide his fate. In response to this powerful, unexpected tactical move his opponents have only found

thoroughly tiresome procedural "torpedoes." Over the microphone came insistent demands for the question of redistribution of powers to be added separately to the agenda. It would be possible to "cover" their true position by such a vote and again block the congress. Then, true, a last means would be left to Yeltsin to achieve his goal—to resign. But the congress went ahead and adopted the new agenda item.

"Left Center," "Smena," "Workers' Union," independents, nonparty deputies, "Cooperation," and "Communists for Democracy" are for the adoption of the resolution. "Rossiya," the agrarians, representatives of the republics, and "Communists of Russia" are against.

The logic of the former groups is that there is no longer any other way to put an end to the continuing confrontation in society and the impotence of today's Russian power structures, to end the chaos and strikes, and—the main thing—to begin realizing the anticrisis program that has been approved in the main.

The logic of the latter group is that the people have given no mandate for investing officials with emergency powers; this is an anticonstitutional measure; first the question of the national-state structure of Russia must be settled, and so forth.

Although S. Baburin stressed that Yeltsin's political statement had been expected—that was why Boris Nikolayevich had not taken the floor for his summing-up speech and waited for 2 April—alas, neither "Rossiya" nor "Communists of Russia" had any strong arguments against the resolution.

After unsuccessful attempts to get through the question of the presidency in one form or another, after Polozkov's speech calling for the preservation of the present—unworkable—Russian leadership, after the exhausting (even from a purely physical point of view), fruitless debates, it would appear that the "Communists of Russia" simply calmed down and relaxed their vigilance.

In their speeches I. Silayev and R. Khasbulatov played their last "trump cards"—the former, in the worst case, in effect refused to accept responsibility for the fulfillment of the economic program, the latter stressed that if the resolution was not adopted Yeltsin's prestige would be raised higher "than the highest mountain."

The resolution was accepted as a working basis by 583 votes to 292. A conciliation commission is to be set up, composed of representatives of deputies' groups. Over the presidium microphone Yeltsin can be heard proposing to Khasbulatov that the draft be examined in an hour's time. The day is drawing to a close—and naturally there is a wish to consolidate success.

But.... There is still more powder in the powder kegs! First the familiar allegations of the uselessness of the electronic system, statements, and protests. In vain! And then.... The chairman of the conciliation commission,

Novikov, suddenly announced perplexedly to the congress that Stepanov (from the republics), Baburin (of "Rossiya"), and Rybkin ("Communists of Russia") were not to be found in "our half" (as one of the halls of the palace is called)—work could not begin. No way!

We hope that by this morning all the missing members of the commission will have been found. True, the "Communists of Russia" and those affiliated to them have one resource left in reserve—to walk out of the congress, leaving it without a quorum.

RSFSR Legitimacy, Power Structure Questioned

PM1604132591 Moscow NOVOYE VREMYA
in Russian No 13, Mar 91 (signed to press 26 Mar 91)
pp 7-8

[Article by Aleksandr Tshipko: "A Backdrop Coming to Life, Only A Renewed, Authoritative Central Power Can Provide the Nucleus for a New Crystallization of the Disintegrating Soviet State"]

[Text] What is the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic]? It is a theatrical backdrop. There have been no legal, still less historical, grounds for the formation of the RSFSR within its present borders. The RSFSR is not Muscovy, the land where the Russians lived and continue to live. It includes much of the old Russian Empire; it preserves Russia's territorial gains in the North Caucasus, in the Volga region, and the Far East. But even so it is not the Russian Empire. It is impossible to explain why the RSFSR should incorporate, for example, Dagestan, where Russians have never lived, but at the same time not include the southwest part of Novorossiia, Odessa, or Bessarabia—which was won from the Turks at the beginning of the 19th century and settled by Russians. It is impossible to explain why present-day Moldova, which lost its state independence back in the 16th century, may, from the viewpoint of "Democratic Russia" ideologists, be a member of a new federation and even acquire full state independence, whereas Tatarstan, which lost its statehood at the same time, cannot.

Payment for the Show

The RSFSR's borders make sense only as administrative borders, facilitating a more efficient administration of these territories. In principle, there has been and there is no need for the creation of the RSFSR Council of Ministers or the RSFSR Supreme Soviet. All this is overhead expenses on ideology, payment for a beautiful theatrical backdrop. The country's Supreme Soviet could, without any need for an understudy, administer the traditional Russian territories, just as the czar's Cabinet of Ministers did in the past. This would be natural. For it is precisely Russia's traditional territories that provide the mainstay of the central power, the core of the state, and its natural historical base. This state power itself loses all sense if it loses direct control over the territories which are now allotted to the RSFSR. Let

me draw your attention to the fact that, in order to govern the country effectively, our real power—the CPSU—was forced to renounce the idea of a republican Russian Communist Party, the idea of a Russian KGB, and the idea of a Russian Academy of Sciences.

Since the RSFSR's legitimacy has always been ideological and artificial, its government has only been able to exist on two conditions: It was obliged to fulfill unquestioningly what the real Russian central power ordered, and not to claim some historical or natural legitimacy.

What is happening today? The theatrical backdrop wants to become a reality, a real political force. The half-state with an artificial ideological legitimacy ("one of the equal Soviet republics") is seeking to become a real independent state—to take the place of the Russian state, preserved in the guise of the USSR and carrying within itself, in concealed form, a historical legitimacy.

What are the results? Primarily, the birth of a new Russian dyarchy, the clash of ideological legitimacy with historical legitimacy, and, as a result, considerable undermining of the sense of the central power and its mainstay. If the idea of RSFSR sovereignty is brought to its logical conclusion, if the program for forming a "Russian Guard" and "Russian money" and the idea of a Russian sovereign president materialize, we would return to the dyarchy of 1917: The Provisional Government and the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and Soldiers' Deputies.

The 'Domino' Effect

Ultimately, the fact that the RSFSR Government has started speaking in the name of historical Russia is primarily the fault of the central power. It is still being crafty, afraid to reveal the secret, to publicize its genuine historical legitimacy, and is thereby allowing Yeltsin to speak in the name of Russia. The tragedy consists in the fact that the very means of substantiating the RSFSR's autonomy and independence, in other words the idea of the self-determination of Soviet socialist republics, is tearing it apart from within. The present USSR Constitution and its underlying Leninist concept of solving the nationalities question in effect give the present-day RSFSR equal rights with its constituent elements. If the RSFSR is only one of the republics, one of the members of the federation, then it is in no way different from Tatarstan, Bashkiria, or Dagestan. As a result, the stronger the RSFSR's desire to isolate itself from the center, the greater the desire of authorities in the autonomous formations to isolate themselves from Yeltsin's power. And, in their own way, they are right. The relations between Russia and the autonomous formations are built on the same principle as the relations between the Union and the RSFSR. The election of an RSFSR president will produce a "domino" effect. After the USSR president's power has declined, the other presidents' powers will begin to decline, too.

In the conditions of the current disintegration of the former totalitarian structure, there is a sharp growth in

the significance of the will of political forces and the choice of their leaders, and in the quantity of alternative paths of development. Yes, the Russia card would have been played sooner or later in the battle for a new power and a new state. But with it, it would have been possible to construct many different permutations. Taking this as one's basis, it would have been possible to act according to the model of the democrats of East Europe, in other words seizing on the idea of "saving the fatherland," overturning communist power, and creating opposition organs of power. But in our conditions, the Russia card could also have been used to destroy the central power as such, to pit the primordially Russian part of the state against its non-Russian part. Incidentally, this line of play was first suggested by our Russophiles, who began to struggle with the center for their own motives back in 1986.

But, instead of struggling for power at the all-Union level, our democrats headed for the niche which was opened up for them by the USSR Constitution and the ideological legitimacy of the RSFSR. "Democratic Russia," which raised the banner of anticommunism, is nonetheless continuing, by inertia, the communist task of destroying Russia, bringing to life the logic of October—the logic of destroying this state to its foundations.

Will the State Be Reassembled?

Some political scientists are suggesting the following model: The sovereignization of autonomous formations is followed by the sovereignization of Russia's oblasts—and this will produce the reassembly of the state on a voluntary basis. This is a utopia, yet another ideological myth. Very many factors are ignored by its inventors. Primarily the fact that all today's political slogans derive from the current transitory state of state and society. All ideas about a new community and the cooperation which will replace the present unitary state are rooted in the still-surviving integrity of the state. Of course, in the present circumstances, when it is difficult to expect the state's complete disintegration, the republics have to choose the "lesser of two evils," agree on the renewed commonwealth proposed by Yeltsin, and support his Federation Council idea. But as soon as the republics succeed in gaining genuine state independence, they may qualitatively change their attitude to this idea. The positions of the nationalists, who will oppose any form of integration with Russia, may be strengthened as a result of isolation. Anyway, as soon as the Union disintegrates, and after it the current RSFSR, the world will be different, a new geopolitical reality will emerge, and the question of a commonwealth of the present Soviet republics will fizzle out of its own accord.

As a rule, we are incapable of thinking ahead. For this reason, we have to rely on common sense; and common sense suggests that we are faced with a banal alternative: Either a modern federal state with a powerful and dynamic central power, once those who want to leave

have left; or the disintegration, the demolition of this country, and the partition of all its constituent elements once and for all.

A renewed, authoritative, and civilized central power can provide the nucleus for the new crystallization of the state. There exists a dilemma: Either Gorbachev's power will change and become authoritarian, or Yeltsin and the democrats will say honestly: We are the central power, after all, successors of the tsarist empire, and not a Soviet republic. We are fighting for power and we promise that, as soon as we take over power in Russia, we will begin to settle relations with all peoples as the successors of Tsarist Russia, and not as representatives of the RSFSR created by Lenin.

What Is Most Beneficial to Ordinary People

Everyone has, for some reason, "buried" Gorbachev ahead of time. It is important for new politicians to "bury" him as soon as possible, since this opens up certain prospects for them. But, it seems to me, it is far more beneficial to ordinary people for Gorbachev to wake up as a reformer and carry out his policy of slow and gradual reforms (of course, I am speaking abstractly) than to acquire a new reformer by way of cataclysms and bloody slaughter.

Russia and the center do not have to reach a compromise. There is the press and the freedom of speech, assembly, and association. Achieve your goals through a general election, if you like, but do not pursue a policy of destroying the center.

Of course, Russians may take their eight or nine Russian oblasts, unite them, and create a new state—a Russian republic. But only local-level politicians and some Russophiles, dreaming of national revival, want this. The leaders of "Democratic Russia," on the other hand, dream of something else—a new commonwealth, a new community of sovereign states; they cannot imagine their future political existence outside some community of the peoples of this country. If the Federation Council rules the country, then, of course, it will again be ruled by the head of the largest republic, in other words by Russia again.

A political game is being played. Some—the RSFSR Communist Party, for example—are speculating on the inertia of imperial thinking, actively exploiting nationalistic motivations and xenophobia, while the other group of politicians are playing on the sense of justice—the other republics have it and we don't. We are witnessing a sophisticated manipulation of national awareness—or rather of its ailments and weaknesses—by various sides.

Diverging Opinions on Cause of Sasovo Explosion

PM1704132591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
15 Apr 91 First Edition p 3

[Correspondent N. Kireyev report: "Incidents: Saltpeter Blown Up from UFO?"]

[Text] Ryazan Oblast—A highly powerful explosion rang out at midnight 12 April near the small city of Sasovo in the Ryazan area. The shock wave roared down its streets, ripping off roofs in some areas and knocking out windows—even the frames—in a good half of the apartment blocks, buildings, and structures. According to eyewitness accounts, multistory blocks rocked as if in an earthquake.

The alarmed residents could not recover their composure before morning, confused as to what had happened. Incidentally, no one suffered serious injury although there were visits to medical institutions: Some people were in shock and some had been cut by broken glass....

Kindergartens and schools were temporarily nonoperational. Drafts blew through buildings before the frames were covered with polythene film.

"The population is now less worried about the results of the incident," A. Rozhkov, chairman of Sasovskiy Rayon Soviet of People's Deputies and party raykom [rayon party committee] first secretary, believes, "than by the uncertainty. It is still unclear what caused the explosion. Some people are talking about munitions left buried since the last war, while others claim that a powerful air bomb fell, a third group blame it on a meteorite, and a fourth group blame UFO's.... There are people who supposedly saw a moving fiery sphere."

"Military men who visited the scene of the explosion," Anatoliy Fedorovich went on, "put forward their own hypothesis: They say that ammonium nitrate exploded. We do not know whom and what to believe. One thing is reassuring: No variations in the radiation background and the composition of the atmosphere have been detected. We are waiting for specialists from the USSR Academy of Sciences and for the results of a chemical and physical analysis."

Certainly, the cause of the explosion is still a mystery although the crater one km from the city, 28 meters in diameter, and roughly four meters deep is, regrettably, a reality. Alongside there were 30 tonnes of fresh ammonium nitrate which was brought to the field 5 April to fertilize the plants. But crop farmers have, after all, successfully used this fertilizer for several years now throughout the country and abroad. Local agricultural chemistry warehouses contain 10,000 tonnes of saltpeter from the consignment that exploded. Thank God, all is quiet there.

The investigation should ultimately shed light on the Sasovo "wonder explosion."

Radio Rossii Status, Plans Discussed

PM1804100191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Apr 91 Union Edition p 7

[M. Murzina report: "Radio Rossii Presents"]

[Text] The presentation of a new radio channel of the All-Russian State Television and Radio Company—Radio Rossii—took place in the Central House of Cinematographers in Moscow 10 April. It did so four months after the first broadcast by this radio channel 10 December last year.

According to experts' assessments, in recent months half of the country's radio audience has been listening to precisely this channel, preferring it to other All-Union Radio channels. What are the reasons for Radio Rossii's such rapid popularity? Its programs are diverse: the permanent rubrics "Chronicle of the Workers Movement," "New Russia—New Leaders," "Russia in Personalities," "From and To," and "Family Evening," the religious program "I Believe," the classical music channel "Gamma," a special program for young people, and a news bulletin every hour. Any convictions are expressed live on the air, except for those that preach violence and ethnic discord. The journalists who work there always have the right to express their own viewpoint. On the whole, the positions of Radio Rossii are those of the Russian legislature.

Today Radio Rossii is "scattered" over various airwaves, and it is sometimes not easy to tune in, to "catch" it on the country's territory: Listeners who admire the new channel call and write the radio channel's editorial office in this regard, and some even complain that the sound of Radio Rossii is muffled on the air. Anxiety remains regarding Radio Rossii's future fate—it was no coincidence that the evening at the Central House of Cinematographers was entitled "To Be Or Not To Be?"

Musicians and artistes performed at the presentation, and USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputies and friends, authors, and employees of Radio Rossii answered questions. There was a lively, warm atmosphere in the hall—is this not a consequence of that same lively, creative, friendly atmosphere that accompanies, so one feels, the work of like-minded journalists?

Radio Rossii Director Sergey Davydov said a few words for our newspaper:

"What new things have we put on the air? An alternative force, an alternative radio has appeared in the electronic medium for the first time. We were the first to breach the monopoly in this sphere.

"Have there been difficulties in our fate? For two months it was possible to hear us on all three channels of all-Union radio airwaves, but on 1 February a special decision of the leadership squeezed Radio Rossii transmissions onto the second all-Union channel (the former third). There have been and still are technical difficulties—we do not have the equipment today with which it would be possible to 'build' a radio station. Therefore we are grateful for the assistance of technical employees of the State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, for this assistance is very important to us. What are our plans? In the summer Radio Rossii is to get its

own channel of 24-hour broadcasting throughout the country's territory, as Mayak has. The problem is one of 'getting access to the button,' as we say—to the transmission network—which is difficult today. Of course, we are ready to cooperate with any progressive services and publications in Russia, the Union, and abroad."

But, for now, listen: Radio Rossii speaking....

RSFSR Foreign Minister Receives FRG's Dregger

*LD1004124291 Moscow TASS International Service
in Russian 1705 GMT 9 Apr 91*

[Excerpts] Moscow, 9 Apr (TASS)—Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Foreign Minister Andrey Kozyrev today received Alfred Dregger, chairman of the Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union group in the FRG Bundestag who is in the USSR at the invitation of the Soviet Committee for European Security and Cooperation. This was announced by the RSFSR Foreign Ministry Press Secretariat.

There was a thorough exchange of opinions on the most topical issues of the European process, bilateral relations, and the political and economic situation in the USSR. [passage omitted]

The interlocutors noted the need to continue political contacts between the leadership of the RSFSR and the FRG and to develop interlegislature ties.

Andrey Kozyrev informed Alfred Dregger about the political and economic situation in the country and the republic and the main decisions of the extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies which has now ended.

***'Communists of Russia' Anticrisis Program**

*91UN1279A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 11 Apr 91 First Edition pp 1,3*

[Article signed by 12 RSFSR people's deputies: "In the Interests of Man: Theses of a Program for Recovery From the Crisis in the Russian Economy's Social Reorientation"]

[Text] During the Third Extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies, a government program for recovery of the republic's economy from the crisis was submitted by RSFSR Council of Ministers Chairman I. S. Siyazev in the course of a discussion of the report "On the Political and Socioeconomic Situation in the RSFSR and Measures to Recover From the Crisis" by RSFSR Supreme Soviet Chairman V. N. Yeltsin and joint reports by RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium members M. L. Zakharov and V. B. Isakov. The program was drawn up for the congress by the "Communists of Russia" deputy group with the participation of economic scientists. Yu. M. Voronin, chairman of the Commission for Budget, Plans, Taxes and Prices of the Republic Council of the

RSFSR Supreme Soviet, acquainted the participants of the congress with the program's theses in his speech.

This week many readers asked the editor's office of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA to print this program, so that they could understand more clearly the position of Communists on this highly important issue. Today we satisfy the will of the readers by publishing the program's theses.

The RSFSR national economy is in the grip of the severest crisis. The population's standard of living is falling abruptly. The republic's economy has been made the victim of a political struggle and ambitions of power. The fate of Russia and the life and welfare of the people are at stake.

The situation as it now stands requires immediate emergency measures, around which all political forces and movements, and all sober-minded people, must unify.

This Program for Recovery From the Crisis and For the Russian Economy's Social Orientation is submitted for examination to this extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies.

1. To Create the Conditions for the Economy's Stabilization

There is only one way out of the crisis—to implement immediate measures to restore the economy's control. In the situation as it now stands, there is no other way. Forced restructuring of property ownership and of distribution relations will do nothing more today than lay further burdens upon the shoulders of the overwhelming majority of the laborers. Normal work must be restored in every enterprise and farm, in the entire transportation net and in the services. At the moment we still have enough raw and other materials, electric power and even certain foodstuffs to do this, but the extreme disorganization of labor, production and economic ties, without which not a single social structure and no forms of ownership are able to develop normally, is making it impossible to utilize them satisfactorily.

1. To Preserve the USSR

For centuries, the peoples inhabiting the USSR have been living within a single state, and they have attained universally recognized progress in economics, education, culture, science, public health and other spheres of human society's development.

The RSFSR's resolve to be a full-fledged, sovereign subject of a renewed USSR on the basis of the new Union agreement has been confirmed. Creation of a unified effective countrywide market system is impossible unless the republics delegate to the center a number of powers vested in them by legislative and normative acts and exercised in a unified Union economic space.

It is impossible to attain stability in the RSFSR economy under the present conditions of opposition with the Union center. Political concordance, strict compliance with the laws and a sufficient level of civic discipline are

needed today as never before. Confrontation must be halted immediately, the limits of the powers of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers and the RSFSR Council of Ministers must be documented in the form of an agreement, previously published decrees and decisions must be mutually reconciled at the soonest, and a proposal to form coordinating commissions in the chambers, in the committees and in the commissions for coordination of USSR and RSFSR legislation must be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the RSFSR Supreme Soviet.

2. To Consolidate the Actions of Sovereign Union Republics

Coordination of the actions of sovereign union republics plays an important role in stabilizing the socioeconomic situation in the RSFSR. Economic relations between the republics are not limited to just exchange of material valuables. Financial and labor resources are being redistributed today on a large scale. There is an ongoing exchange of accomplishments of science, technology and culture, and of other accomplishments of the spiritual life of the peoples.

The danger of destructive consequences to the economic complex of each republic from rendering absolute the thesis that local legislation supersedes central legislation must be accounted for realistically. Division of the country and the republics making it up into individual states would mean changing the character of economic ties between them and would ruin the unified economic space.

An attempt to substitute a Union agreement by interrepublic agreements is contrary to the orientation on forming market relations. Rather than enterprises, republics and territories become the subjects of business management. The center's efforts to create a free market space are in limbo. This cannot be allowed.

3. To Ensure the Unity of Actions of Sociopolitical Parties and Movements

A sharp political struggle has evolved in the country. The state foundations of the USSR are being intensively shaken from within, and people are being prodded toward civil disobedience. A course toward the disintegration of the Union, toward intensification of total opposition to the country's leadership, and toward disregard of the USSR Constitution and Union legislation has been taken.

The political struggle, in which the most vital interests of the Russian people are being offered for sacrifice, must be halted. Legislative and normative acts directed at strengthening the republic's socialist structure must be intensively prepared and approved.

Given the actual disposition of political forces, implementation of measures to recover from the crisis would require the national concordance of all peoples of the

RSFSR, and the moral support and help of all of our compatriots in union republics and of all peoples of the USSR.

The Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies must appeal to all citizens of the republic, trade unions, strike and workers' committees, and all citizens to impose a moratorium on strikes, together with a proposal to voluntarily accept the burden of anticrisis measures. Recovery from the crisis would be impossible without losses. The task is to minimize these losses. Other than the people, there is no driving force capable of restoring equilibrium in the society and moving forward.

II. Immediate Measures to Stabilize the Economy

The goal is to curb the decline in production and the decrease in the people's standard of living, to reestablish, in 1991-1992, the previous level of consumption of foodstuffs, goods and services by the majority of the RSFSR population, and to create the conditions for its further increase.

1. To Halt Political Violence on the Economy

To legislatively confirm, during the period of stabilization, the priority of the economic ties that had evolved in the unified economic space. To halt violent destruction of regional, intrasector and intradepartmental specialization and cooperation of production. To adopt a law prohibiting work stoppages based on political motives, and a law making organizers of political strikes that inflict damage upon the national economy materially and administratively liable;

- to raise responsibility (including criminal) for sabotage of transportation or obstruction of railroads;
- to introduce stiff economic and administrative sanctions for violating the requirements on timely deliveries and on the quality of delivered products and goods.

2. To Restore the Economy's Controllability

To form the infrastructure of market relations successfully, without forcing these processes. To strictly measure the movement toward market relations against preservation of the economy's controllability. The control system must ensure coordination of mutual production relations and satisfaction of the republic's pressing needs.

To return to planned regulation of the RSFSR's economic and social development, and to correct previously written and adopted plans for development of regions, oblasts and cities. Only with reliance upon a control system that is understood and assimilated by executives at all levels can we stabilize the economy and create the foundation for more confident movement toward a market. This is the road of reason, labor and initiative, a road of transition to a qualitatively higher level of the people's vital activities.

To draw up extraordinary plans for the RSFSR's economic and social development in the second half of 1991 and in 1992.

To begin development of variants of long-range and annual plans for the RSFSR's economic and social development, and writing state programs determined by the RSFSR Congress of People's Deputies.

To encourage labor collectives and organs of economic and state control to participate in the plan writing process, which will promote consolidation of Soviet society, and have a stabilizing influence on the economy.

To introduce, as of 1992 for all enterprises, a single republic state order for delivery of products that would account for the needs of union, republic and local programs and for deliveries based on interrepublic agreements.

To delineate the functions of the RSFSR State Committee for Material and Technical Supply and the USSR Gosstab, and to transfer, to the republic in the first half of this year, the wholesale middleman organizations of the USSR Gosstab, the activity of which is associated primarily with managing resources produced in the RSFSR (timber, construction materials and so on).

To gradually constrict the process of delivering centrally distributed resources to consumers through republic ministries and departments. To clearly define the range and volume of products, jobs and services in relation to which state deliveries and centralized distribution are to be continued. These deliveries must ensure satisfaction of the basic national economic needs of the republic, and embrace the entire production cycle of the most important types of products. To sharply intensify leadership in this effort by the RSFSR government.

In the first half of this year:

- to draw up a republic conversion program and to adopt a law that would regulate relations between the republic and the country's defense complex, and promote growth of production of products needed by the civilian population;
- to foresee measures to supply material resources on priority to social consumption funds and to construction of housing and social and cultural facilities;
- to write and adopt the following legislative acts:

"On the Procedure for Delivering Products in Satisfaction of State Needs (On the State Order)," "On Antimonopoly Policy," "On the Procedure for Writing and Implementing Republic and Regional Programs," "On Interrepublic Deliveries of Products and Goods."

3. Improvement of Finances and Money Circulation—The Key Objective of the Economy's Stabilization

To assume a stiffer monetary and financial policy. To adopt a statewide decision to prohibit any actions directed at growth of state centralized investments and management expenses.

To draw up an extraordinary budget for the second half of 1991. To end budget financing of all expense items without which function of organizations and institutions at the currently attained level can be ensured.

To reconcile, with union laws, legislative acts adopted in the RSFSR on problems of bank activity. To join the effort to transform the USSR State Bank System into the USSR Reserve System, which foresees unified, coordinated credit and monetary regulation rules binding upon all union republics, including reserve requirements on commercial banks, standard interest rates, unity of the principles of bank surveillance and so on.

To effect a transition to forming the budgets of local soviets on the basis of stable long-range standards. To establish a direct dependence between the budget of each local soviet and the profit acquired on its territory or income obtained by enterprises.

To immediately reconcile union and republic legislation that would foresee unified principles and approaches to organizing tax and budget matters. To ensure that taxation and the sum total of tax benefits would make the social development of every labor collective directly dependent on work results, on the level of use of the accomplishments of scientific-technical progress, and on growth of profit.

To write and adopt a special government program to fight the shadow economy and to eliminate unearned income; it should foresee the following particular measures:

- legislatively confirming equal possibilities and business conditions for enterprises of all types and forms of ownership;
- raising the effectiveness of the work of economic, monitoring and auditing, tax, and law enforcement organs in preventing and revealing economic crimes;
- establishing control over the population's income, to include abolishing the multiplicity of accounts in savings banks and requiring mandatory submission of statements of income sources;
- introducing a progressive inheritance tax.

4. To Establish an Active Pricing Policy

To support a price setting policy coordinated with all republics and foreseeing establishment of the same limits for the entire country on raising state regional prices on the principal food and nonfood goods determining the population's standard of living.

To require the councils of ministers of republics in the RSFSR and the oblast and kray soviets of people's deputies to repeal all prices they set previously which exceed maximum state and listed retail prices, and to examine the possibility of introducing lower prices on certain goods produced and consumed locally.

In connection with liberalizing prices, to intensify control over compliance with the established price setting procedure, to promptly rescind prices set in violation of

existing law, to apply the full power of economic sanctions against enterprises and organizations violating state price discipline, and to implement measures to prosecute persons guilty of these violations.

To write legislative acts regulating price setting, and to develop effective control of prices and a mechanism for indexing the population's income.

5. To Create Order in Foreign Economic Activity

To develop a legal basis for the republic's control of foreign economic activity, including a system for regulating customs affairs, hard currency operations, foreign investments and the activities of joint ventures, as well as licensing and the setting of quotas on export-import operations.

To create a conception for development of foreign commercial ties in each oblast, kray and republic. To implement measures to develop exports of local products, and reduce exports of highly scarce goods and secondary resources needed for internal consumption. To expand the powers and interest of the republics, krays and oblasts in creating territorial foreign economic intermediary organizations.

To develop the banking network of the RSFSR Bank for Foreign Economic Relations. To allow the leasing of various sorts of property, ensure legal protection of foreign investors on RSFSR territory and resolve the question of their banking services as a means of attracting foreign capital.

6. To Improve the Organizational Structure of the Economy's Control

To introduce gradual transformation of the present organizational structure of control, beginning with the RSFSR Council of Ministers, together with gradual liquidation of organs and structures becoming irrelevant as a result of development of market relations. Existing units must not be dismantled in this case without establishing the necessary preconditions for this.

To restore dismantled republic structures coordinating the activities of industrial enterprises and construction organizations, and to simultaneously make their functions more democratic.

To restore the vertical system of subordination of executive organs so that governments and soviet executive committees at different levels would be under dual subordination—under the corresponding soviets of people's deputies and higher organs of executive power. Decisions adopted by higher organs within the limits of their competency must be binding on the level below.

To make the necessary corrections in the existing mechanisms of adopting and implementing decisions, and in the work methods of legislative and executive powers in order to raise the personal responsibility of officials.

To impose, during the period of stabilization of the socioeconomic situation, moratoriums on all adopted republic and local legislation contrary to all-union and republic laws.

To implement a program of measures to divide the functions of state regulation of the economy and direct management and to create an information system embracing all of the market's principal elements—supply, demand, prices, commodity and money turnover, consumption and the social factors of the market's formation and development.

III. To Impart a Greater Social Orientation to the Economy

Profound deformations in the structure of industry and the backwardness of the agroindustrial complex, of consumer goods production and of the services sphere require pursuit of a unified state investment structure policy aimed at redistributing resources in favor of the economy's consumption sector. Without this, any attempts to make the economy socially oriented relying only on the market control mechanism would be in vain.

1. Priority Attention to the Agroindustrial Complex and to Food Production

To prevent a further decline in agricultural production. To organize mutual relations between the industrial and agrarian sectors and provide organized state assistance to agriculture:

- to restore production ties of enterprises and organizations of the agroindustrial complex with enterprises of other national economic sectors. To correct the state order for 1991 for delivery of industrial products to rural areas (machinery, equipment, spare parts for the former, fuel and lubricants, mineral fertilizers and chemicals), to devote a special subdivision of the plan to it, and to instruct the Extraordinary Food Commission created by the extraordinary Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies to monitor its fulfillment;
- to introduce fixed wholesale prices on all material and technical resources supplied to the agroindustrial complex. In the event of their further growth, to carry out systematic indexing of state procurement prices;
- to help kolkhozes, sovkhozes and peasant (private) farms and agricultural enterprises to conclude the overwintering of farm animals, preserve herd size and raise productivity;
- to provide special support to large specialized poultry and pig raising complexes;
- to resolve the matter of sensible use of reserves of grain and other agricultural products available at the farms by means of mutual deliveries of materials and equipment, by changes in prices and by implementing other economic and organizational measures;
- to introduce payment in kind of up to 10 percent of wages at RSFSR kolkhozes and sovkhozes; in this case accounts must be settled with workers before the farm fully settles its accounts with the state;
- to require republic and local state government organs

to determine measures by which to keep the sowing area of the principal crops at the 1990 level, and to organize the signing of contracts with industrial enterprises, organizations and executive committees of city soviets concerning their participation in spring field work and harvesting;

- to ensure transfer of ineffectively utilized land in the state fund to people desiring to work the land for the cultivation of potatoes and vegetables, within a month's time;
- to rescind restrictions on development of private farms;
- to provide sowing and planting material to farmers. To require the republic's government to mobilize all of available resources to create the corresponding seed potato fund.

To make corrections in programs of organized assistance that were drawn up in every region, city and labor collective, to reinforce the economic interest of partners, and to stimulate industrial enterprises and organizations to join the effort to repair agricultural equipment, train machine operators and erect production, social, cultural and personal service facilities in rural areas.

To require the RSFSR Supreme Soviet to adopt legislation on priority supply of materials and equipment to the agroindustrial complex; on maintaining equivalency in intersector exchange between agriculture and other sectors of the economy; on land tax; the Land Code.

To foresee measures ensuring profitable agricultural production in all regions of the republic. When drawing up the plan and budget of the Russian Federation for 1992, to examine measures by which to revive the Russian garden, develop the agroindustrial complex, and make ensuring full utilization of the productive capacities of processing and light industry the main priority of the republic's national economy.

2. To Prevent a Decline in Nonfood Goods Production

To implement the following measures aimed at stabilizing consumer goods production:

- balance calculated production volumes of goods and services in the current year with Soviet and imported raw materials; examine proposals by local organs to utilize free productive capacities;
- ensure that contracts to deliver raw and other materials and parts are signed at not less than the 1990 level within the framework of existing economic ties;
- establish the procedures for setting quotas on deliveries of raw materials abroad, allowing them only when internal demand for raw and other materials is fully satisfied;
- allow barter deals in the manufacture of production and technical goods as a means of purchasing raw and other materials abroad for light and textile industry;
- implement measures of economic pressure upon producers for ineffective expenditure of raw and other materials, while significantly encouraging a decrease

in the materials-intensiveness of production and of finished articles.

To activate efforts of local economic and soviet organs to improve the supply of food and basic necessities to the population by developing auxiliary farms, improving the activity of consumer cooperatives and trade on commission, and increasing production of the simplest basic necessities out of local raw materials and industrial wastes.

To implement stiff administrative and legal measures in order to stem the flow of goods out of the state network into speculative channels.

To ensure full implementation, in 1991-1992, of measures stated in the programs for reequipping light industry, sectors of the agroindustrial complex and services.

To seek out capital investments and the necessary resources with which to finish construction of output capacities producing consumer goods and to develop services, introduction of which had been halted earlier.

In order to stimulate production of consumer goods and paid services:

- grant enterprises the right to retain profit from the sale of goods and services beyond the attained level in the corresponding period of the previous year;
- establish that any increase enjoyed in consumer goods production in comparison with the level attained in the corresponding period of the previous year could be used at the discretion of the producing enterprises and the local soviets of people's deputies in equal measure;
- tighten discipline in the delivery of raw and other materials used in the production of goods and services. If enterprises use funds allocated to them contrary to their intended purpose, they must return to the budget up to 50 percent of the cost of the goods and services that could have been produced with the indicated resources.

3. To Restructure Industrial Production

To declare a moratorium of two years on reductions in production of needed products for ecological considerations, and to reestablish planned output capacities. To open in 1991 all pharmaceutical industry plants that had been shut down for this reason.

To have a commission survey other closed enterprises and make decisions concerning resumption of production.

To allow enterprises under the republic's jurisdiction to utilize available material reserves for the production of consumer goods, to be sold locally on priority, in the event that a principal production operation is shut down due to the failure of delivery of raw materials or parts.

To establish tax benefits for all industrial enterprises producing agricultural equipment, tools for peasant farms and the private farms of citizens, and rural buildings and structures for the storage and processing of agricultural products.

To develop a program for the development of the network of intersector production operations in order to allow mobile servicing of all sectors of the national economy.

To create, within the framework of the republic's conversion program, economically independent, modern production operations using new production procedures and possessing a high-output design and experimental base, so that they could fill state orders for the designing and production of durable consumer goods and the equipment with which to manufacture them.

To examine the possibility for expanding manufacture of products (aerospace technology, aircraft construction, ship building, isotope industry etc.) that could become objects of export, of the sale of licenses and of services rendered to other countries.

4. To Develop a State Scientific and Technical Policy

Establishment of the sovereignty of the RSFSR requires immediate development of the conception of state scientific and technical policy. The RSFSR Academy of Sciences should be given the organizing and coordinating role in its formation.

The following should be foreseen in selecting and evaluating the priority directions of scientific and technical progress:

- preferential development of fundamental and exploratory research on the most important problems in the republic, not only in the natural and technical sciences but also in economics, sociology, culture, history and international relations;
- development of a mechanism by which to implement a unified scientific and technical policy, and development of the forms and methods of its state support and of control on the part of the government through all-union, republic and regional programs;
- elimination of monopolies in scientific and technical progress and in development of the market for scientific and technical products;
- organization of a continuing education system, and creation of the possibility for its dynamic adaptation to changes in the objectives of scientific and technical progress;
- creation of favorable conditions for various highly effective forms of scientific and technical creativity and for integration of science and production;
- assistance in developing the scientific and technical potential of individual regions;
- active participation in international cooperation and division of labor, enlargement of the proportion of competitive scientific and science-intensive products in the country's export potential, purposeful import

of ideas and production procedures, and active participation in international projects and programs.

The RSFSR's state scientific and technical policy must account fully for the fundamentally new conditions in which it is to be carried out—the tendency for decentralization of resources, the diversity of the sources of financing, and the unique features of the interests of the subjects of economic activity; it must be organically correlated with taxation and loan policy, with the system of state subsidies and grants, and with the principles of forming and utilizing various funds not supported by the budget.

5. To Improve the Investment Process

To finish formation of the republic's construction complex:

- accelerate transfer of construction and installation organizations of union ministries and departments working in the republic, enterprises and organizations of construction materials industry in the Soyuzstroy-materialy Association (the republic part of it), and organizations and enterprises of the sector scientific, research and design complex operating on the republic's territory, to the jurisdiction of the RSFSR government;
- adopt the law "On Investment Activity in the RSFSR" in the first half of 1991;
- introduce the republic state order for construction of facilities, and develop the mechanism of state economic regulation of investment activity, one which would ensure, by way of a system of tax rates, sanctions and benefits, implementation of the priority directions of investment policy and development of the social sphere, the agroindustrial complex, light industry and other sectors working in behalf of the consumer market;
- prepare and adopt a republic investment program ensuring a 1.5-2-time increase in production of construction materials, structures and articles within the next two to three years. Allocate the needed financial and material resources and equipment to attain this objective, establish effective economic stimuli, encourage all sectors of the national economy to participate, and make wide use of the possibilities of conversion of defense industry, and of local resources. Create regional markets trading in construction materials, structures, equipment and household articles;
- adopt a republic program for reinforcing and developing the material and equipment base of construction machine building in 1991-1995. Form the Rosstroy Mash State Scientific-Production Association on the basis of enterprises of the machine building complex that produce and maintain equipment outfits and production lines for the construction sector, road building equipment, and small mechanized tools and instruments;
- restore the system of material, technical and equipment support to capital construction. Make a transition to providing construction organizations with

resources on the basis of contracts with territorial organs of the RSFSR Goskomobespecheniye [not further identified];

- draw up priority republic legislative and normative acts supporting the legal and normative activities of organizations and enterprises of the construction complex under the conditions afforded by market relations; on the price setting system in construction under the conditions of the transition to contracted prices, on measures to hold personnel in their jobs in construction during the time of transition to market relations, and on the mechanism for regulating the wages of organizations and enterprises in the construction sector employing different forms of ownership;
- revive previously abolished agencies coordinating the activities of construction organizations, including in the RSFSR Council of Ministers. Give the RSFSR Goskomarkhstroy [not further identified] or a ministry created on its basis the function of state regulation of investments into capital construction, organization of contracting outlets for union and republic facilities to be built on the basis of state orders, organization of a state and an independent service to license construction organizations and contracting outlets, and organization of independent expert companies carrying out the functions of evaluating the quality of designs and construction in support of the signing of agreements on contracting out and ensuring finished facilities, evaluating risk, and carrying out other insurance operations.

IV. To Organize the Process of Transforming Property Relations

Creating more powerful stimuli of highly productive, high quality labor and forming free commodity producers—the most important element of a market economy—must become the most important means of recovering from the crisis and raising production effectiveness.

Denationalization of public property and formation of an economy in the RSFSR based on a multiplicity of principles is proceeding sporadically, without due control on the part of the state, in the absence of wide glasnost, and without regard for the vital interests of laborers. Enterprises and organizations are often bought out by collectives and private individuals without preliminary state inventory and market appraisal of property, in the absence of legislative and normative acts determining the principles, procedures and limits of denationalization, and the procedures for buying out property.

Highly punitive privatization is being imposed as the dominant form of property transformation under the excuse that there is no other means for the country's fastest possible recovery from the economic crisis, and to the benefit of the political struggle for power.

This will essentially lead to denationalization of property and, for practical purposes, a shift in the society's sociopolitical nature. Such a course of events cannot be acceptable.

The main goal of reforming property ownership must be to surmount alienation of laborers from the implements of production and from their products. In the course of denationalization, the national, collective nature of property must be preserved by significantly altering the forms of business management in the direction of motivating laborers to make better use of property. The state must maintain the leading role in managing the basic, structure-determining sectors of production and the national economy.

To adopt, at the soonest, decisions to specifically define ownership of state property at different levels of control in the USSR and the RSFSR, by subjects of the federation and by local soviets, and decisions concerning the priorities and timetable of denationalization.

To determine state-owned facilities to be denationalized at different levels of control, the principal forms of denationalization, the methods of property appraisal, and the financial sources for complete or advantageous buy-out.

To announce a moratorium on privatization until an efficient mechanism of denationalization free of bureaucratic tyranny is created, in the interests of raising production effectiveness.

To establish an interconnection between denationalization and other measures associated with the transition to a market economy, and primarily formation of a market infrastructure.

To draw up a republic program for forming capital and commodity markets, insurance, auditing and holding companies, brokerages, commercial banks, trading halls, intermediary trading companies, commercial centers and companies, auction halls, fairs and so on.

To form a start-to-finish system of independent agencies at all levels of the Russian Federation to coordinate the transition to a market economy locally.

To develop a complex of measures to train and retrain administrative personnel with regard for the requirements on the content and methods of activity of executives and specialists, in application to market relations.

To prepare public opinion and evaluate the social consequences of transforming property relations.

To popularize denationalization, to grant collectives of state enterprises the right of complete economic possession and disposal of property and the products of their labor. To transfer the majority of property into the hands of labor collectives without compensation. To carry out all property transformations with the direct participation of labor collectives, in their interests, and under the society's control.

The following must become the principal directions of property denationalization: transforming state enterprises into joint-stock companies, leasing state property, including with the option to buy, selling small state enterprises, organizations and production operations to families and individuals, transforming them into cooperatives or permitting gradual buy-out of state property by members of a labor collective, and creating joint ventures with foreign citizens and legal persons. To support implementation of land reform and creation of the conditions for effective activity by peasant and private farms, cooperatives, kolkhozes, sovkhoses and other forms of organization of land management.

Shutting down unprofitable and low-profit enterprises for the sake of saving money is impermissible in the initial period of reforming property relations. They must function as a means of preserving business ties and jobs. The task is to reveal such enterprises and develop individual reorganization programs for them which could then be carried out in the next stage of the reform.

V. To Ensure Effective Social Protection of the Population

Forming market relations in the economy, the state will ensure creation of a mechanism of effective social protection of people, and it guarantees a minimum level of social blessings for all strata of the population through public consumption funds. The standard of living of employable citizens must be raised and the population's social, cultural and personal needs must be satisfied primarily through the personal contribution made by each person to social production.

Conditions must be created for highly effective, productive labor, and parasitism must be eliminated.

Real outlays on reproduction of qualified manpower must be reflected in the wages of laborers.

Minimum guaranteed wages, minimum leave time and the minimum work week may be raised depending on the work effectiveness of the labor collective.

To draw up a republic program to protect the work and social interests of young people and provide assistance to young families and servicemen in satisfying housing and personal needs, and to ensure a worthy standard of living for retired and disabled persons.

To place a priority on protection of maternity and childhood, and on educating the growing generation. To protect the population's income from inflation by enacting compensations and indexing income depending on growth of the cost of living.

The experience of other countries shows that introducing market relations involves a decrease in employment in the productive sphere. The state is obligated to minimize the expenses incurred by laborers who lose their jobs. The state employment service must ensure maximum reduction of an individual's period of unemployment, it must provide assistance in job placement, it must create

conditions for personnel retraining and career counseling, it must support creation of new jobs, and it must provide material support to the temporarily unemployed. Local soviets and their employment services must play an active role in this.

A labor market and the free movement of manpower associated with it will inevitably lead to formation of a housing market. In this connection, principles and mechanisms of housing reform that would ensure the laborers' constitutional right to housing must be quickly determined.

The transition to a market economy requires an especially attentive attitude toward development of public health, education, culture, protection of nature, and science. Because commercialization of these spheres of the national economy is impermissible, the state must continue to absorb the larger part of the expenses of maintaining them.

In order to ensure substantial social protection of its citizens, the state must have a strong financial base, one founded on highly effective operation of the entire productive sphere.

In this critical hour, every person, every Russian patriot has no choice other than to unite effort in the face of the danger looming over our society, and no priority other than averting the collapse of the economy by means of all forces and resources. It is time to put an end to the useless theorizing, to the unending "market" overtures, to the hope of foreign assistance. In order to surmount today's difficulties, the most important things we need are unity of concept and actions, labor discipline and organization. Without this, even the most attractive programs (no matter how radical or conservative they may be) will lose all meaning, and will simply drop by the wayside.

The emergency situation requires that organizers who are not simply conscientious but also competent, purposeful and decisive, capable of acting in the face of risk, and at the same time ready to assume full responsibility for carrying out their assigned tasks, and knowing how to get results, be put to work in the most important areas of economic development.

RSFSR People's Deputies:	
Comrade [name illegible]	[number illegible] Election District
	Doctor of Economic Sciences
Comrade [name illegible]	93d Election District
	Doctor of Philosophical Sciences, Professor
Comrade [name illegible]	75th Election District
	Doctor of [word illegible] Sciences
Comrade [name illegible]	740th Election District

	Candidate of Economic Sciences, Docent
Comrade Kalashnikov	631st Election District
	Candidate of Agricultural Sciences
[name illegible], T. P.	[number illegible] Election District
	Corresponding Member of the USSR Academy of Sciences, [several words illegible]
[name illegible]	524th Election District
	Candidate of [word illegible] Sciences, [word illegible]
Rybkin, I. P.	112th Election District
	Candidate of [word illegible] Sciences, [word illegible]
[name illegible]	125th Election District
	[several words illegible]
[name illegible]	203d Election District
Sokolov, O. S.	205th Election District
	Doctor of Physicomathematical Sciences, Professor
Vedernikov, I. T.	692d Election District
	Doctor of Legal Sciences, Professor

Western Republics

Further Reportage on Ukrainian Strikes 16-17 Apr

Supreme Soviet Bans Strikes 16 Apr

PM1804110791 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 18 Apr 91 First Edition p 3

["Direct Line" report by Colonel A. Polyakov: "Strikes Outlawed"]

[Text] Kiev, 17 Apr—On Tuesday, 16 April the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet adopted by an absolute majority of votes the decision to ban strikes, rightly suggesting that they are leading to economic collapse and are damaging sovereignty. A Supreme Soviet commission has been set up to discuss the demands being put forward by the workers and the strike committees of the miners, transportation workers, and some enterprises. Meanwhile, however, far from all trolleybuses were out on the streets of Kiev on Wednesday, which will undoubtedly affect the working rhythm of the city.

A calm, considered dialogue is obviously not to the taste of the separatist forces. Those who are doing everything to urge the miners on to link their economic demands with political demands—including the release of the notorious S. Kkmara, who is charged with criminal activity—gathered in Kreshchatik on Wednesday from the morning onwards.

Legislative Session on Strike Noted

*PM1804140591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2*

[“Direct Line” report by Sergey Tsikora: “Legislature Irritable, Streets Agitated”]

[Text] Kiev—The 16 April strike in Kiev was not a general strike but it indisputably spurred the parliament to intensive work.

The speech delivered by Vitold Fokin, chairman of the Ukrainian Council of Ministers, somewhat cooled passions. He told deputies about the set of measures by which the government intends to alleviate tension in the republic and normalize economic life. The Ukrainian Supreme Soviet has instructed the republic's government to submit within a 10-day period for the legislature to examine all USSR presidential and Union Cabinet of Ministers resolutions in contravention of the Declaration on Ukrainian Sovereignty and Ukrainian laws.

Ukrainian Government head Fokin also told the legislature that it is planned to introduce a special form of money in the republic—solely for food purchases.

The “food rubles” will be printed at the printing house of the Main Administration for the Production of State Bank Notes, Coins, and Medals—the republic is about to agree to this with Union premier V. Pavlov.

Now a word about another resolution adopted by the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet 16 April. The legislature backed L. Kravchuk's proposal to consider calls for a strike—regardless of their provenance and aims—as seeking to disrupt the republic's economy and as action contrary to the interests of the peoples of the Ukraine and its sovereignty. However, next morning there were once again plenty of miners on Kreshchatik's main square from all mining regions of the Ukraine. And Kiev's students and schoolchildren came along, too.

Striking Workers' Demands Met

*LD1804142791 Moscow TASS in English 1405 GMT
18 Apr 91*

[By UKRINFORM-TASS correspondents Alexey Petrunya and Marina Tarnavskaya]

[Text] Kiev April 18 TASS—The demands of the local transport workers who took part in a warning strike on April 16-17 were met in an agreement reached at a meeting between the strikers' representatives with the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Deputy Chairman Vladimir Grinev, the republican Deputy Prime Minister Vladimir Borisovskiy, the Kiev Mayor Grigoriy Malyshevskiy and heads of some republican ministries.

The strikers demanded pay rises, lower prices on food-stuffs and basic necessities, the abolition of the so-called “presidential” five-percent sales tax and the adoption of

income indexation laws. The agreement signed at the meeting envisages the time and the ways of fulfilling the demands. The republican supreme soviet and the council of ministers will be acquainted with the document.

The strike committees may renew the strike if the demands are not fulfilled. The authorities, in their turn, may annul the agreement in case the transport workers violate their obligations.

Ukrainian Central Committee Plenum Held

*PM1804115991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Apr 91 Second Edition p 2*

[Correspondents M. Odinets and I. Tikhomirov report: “Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum”]

[Text] A Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee plenum was held yesterday. S.I. Gurenko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and first secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee, delivered a report on the sociopolitical situation in the republic and progress in fulfilling urgent measures to clear up the aftermath of the Chernobyl catastrophe.

The keynote speaker and other speakers noted in the debates that the reform of retail prices, as an enforced measure, has not met with working people's understanding. The ill-considered nature of certain provisions in the reform, shortcomings in its implementation, and especially the fact that the considerable price rise was not backed up by the promised substantial compensation and measures to index-link the population's incomes have aggravated social tension in society.

The plenum pointed out that the price rise which has been carried out does not correspond to the 28th Ukrainian Communist Party Congress' course, which envisages that the main burden of the switch to the market should be borne by the state.

The plenum participants expressed profound alarm at the prolonged continuation of strikes at a number of the republic's enterprises. The Ukrainian Communist Party, communist USSR people's deputies, and members of the republic's government, while supporting the miners' just demands for an improvement in their working and living conditions, are doing everything in their power to resolve the urgent problems of the socioeconomic recovery of the coal mining regions.

However, it is becoming increasingly clear, speeches noted, that the miners' just discontent is being skillfully used by those who operate on the principle of “the worse things are the better it is.” Speculating on the difficulties and taking advantage of imperfections in the law, they have turned the miners' movement into a means of struggling for power. The reality is that the prolonged strike now bears not an economic character but a political one. Its organizers' real intentions are to finally

paralyze the socialist state and thereby achieve the overthrow of constitutional power.

In the dramatic situation which has been created, the plenum participants said, the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee reaffirms its determination to work for the fulfillment of the mine collectives' justified demands relating to the improvement of their living and working conditions. At the same time the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee categorically rejects the attempt to turn strikes into a method of political blackmail. The plenum appealed to the strikers' civic consciousness and sense of responsibility: Do not let the political intriguers use you in their political games, which are hurting the lives of ordinary people! Show wisdom, restraint, and good sense! It is time to renounce confrontation, all problems can and must be resolved at the negotiating table.

Dwelling on questions connected with clearing up the aftermath of the catastrophe at the Chernobyl nuclear power station, the keynote speaker and other speakers stated that considerable work has been done in the republic in that respect. At the power station itself and in the affected regions large scale engineering and technical, nature protection, and socioeconomic measures have been carried out aimed at creating normal living conditions and guaranteed protection for people's health.

At the same time it was said pointedly that the urgent measures to clear up the aftermath of the Chernobyl catastrophe which are planned for 1990-1992 are being fulfilled slowly, which is causing serious concern. The resources allocated for this are not being fully utilized. The plenum stressed the need for the unconditional fulfillment of the program to clear up the aftermath of the Chernobyl catastrophe.

The Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee Plenum adopted a decision urging working people to display a high level of consciousness at this difficult hour and to prevent the further destabilization of the situation.

Kiev Union Council Urges Price Rise Compensation

LD1704115891 Kiev International Service in English
0000 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] Kiev Regional Council of Trade Unions has adopted an appeal to the Ukrainian Parliament and government of the republic in connection with the price rise and worsening living standards of the Ukrainian people. The document reads that dissatisfaction with the economic policy carried out by the USSR Government leads to distrust in the center. The people have already lost their confidence in the future, and this may lead to an organized form of protest. The council of Trade Unions demands that the parliament and government of Ukraine should adopt immediately legislative acts on indexation of incomes in the republic for reimbursement of spending due to the price rise.

Russian-Ukrainian Relations Examined

91UN1274A Kiev PRAVDA UKRAINY in Russian
23 Mar 91 p 3

[Article by A. Blinov under the "The Personal Is General" rubric: "Respond With Kindness"]

[Text] If people live according to the laws of kindness and friendship, understanding and charity, then it is quite unimportant who you are—Russian or Georgian, Ukrainian or Kazakh, Belorussian or Jew—and what color your skin is. You would be a Human—that is your chief designation. Which, properly speaking, is the healthy moral basis of Homo Sapiens as the sole representative of higher reason on our sinful, discordant world.

I do not remember where I heard or read the aforementioned paragraph (or perhaps I thought it up myself?), but the affirmation and elevation of humanity in man and the reinforcement of the community of people on the principles of sincerity and honesty makes good sense to me and, I am convinced, to the majority of Soviets. It is when one person, even in the heat of the moment, does not scornfully call another "katsap" or "khokhol," "zhid" or "natsmen," "chuchmek" or any other insulting nickname debasing one's ethnic and personal worth. It is when one responds with a respectful "comrade."

I am sick of the way some new "democrats" must refer to themselves as "pan" and "gospodin" [Mr.]. We have already had enough of that! We have had enough of dividing people into castes—those with blue blood and common people, which means second-class people. Should we not dismiss it as a joke and just say that humor is keeping pace with democracy? Unfortunately, I cannot. This is humor of a special kind. He, the "democrat," becomes a gentleman in relation to me, while I am just a common person. And, God forbid, I pertain to that same "impure" blood that is generally unworthy of the attention of a gentleman.

Is this not taking place in individual regions of the country at present? Such as in those places where inter-ethnic tension is artificially aggravated, and where laws are adopted on the exclusive right of the indigenous population to possess its historical territory and to view as undesirable their neighbors who, by the will of fate, settled there from other regions. Under the guise of preserving ethnic groups, nationalities, and peoples, ethnic isolation is propagandized, frequently bordering on unbridled nationalism. There are more than enough examples of this: One only has to open a newspaper or turn on the television. In one place and then in another people are increasingly saying that it would be advisable to decrease the number of "Russian occupiers." In order to improve the indigenous nation, so to say.

It is taken for granted that there have been many flaws in our ethnic policy. Let us mention only Stalin's great resettlements of whole peoples—there is and can be no excuse for that! But how can we repair the injustice?

Given the example of the Crimean Tatars, we have already become convinced that a mass spontaneous return to one's home region is attended by costs and interethnic problems. Should we simply convince people that they need to live in peace as one family and be friends? But there also have been more than enough words and appeals....

But we need to live. And however paradoxical it may sound, we are historically doomed to live as a single community. But for that we need to learn to listen and understand one another....

I am a Russian. At the end of the twenties my father and mother moved to the Ukraine in search of a slice of bread. Becoming a worker, at nights my father studied Ukrainian. And not unsuccessfully, because he headed the rayon newspaper *LENINSKA ZIRKA*, which was a kind of family university. Four of the children took the path of Ukrainian journalism.

But recently an acquaintance dumbfounded me by asking, "What kind of Russian are you if you were born in the Ukraine? All your brothers and sister are Ukrainians." It is as though I was divided in two. I must confess that in our family of many children no such "ethnic" question ever arose. At least on the same level that it is now posed by some pseudodemocrats with the goal of sowing interethnic enmity. Should I adapt myself to circumstances? When it is most profitable should I say that I am Russian—by my parents, or Ukrainian—by my place of birth? But neither I nor my children and grandchildren want that kind of duplicity. "I was, am, and will be Russian...." But from childhood I have considered my Homeland to be the blue-eyed Ukraine, which I have loved with my heart and soul.

Since my earliest years I have also nourished a filial feeling for the mother of my ancestors—Russia. It is stamped into my memory how, in the years of the wartime evacuation, a compassionate Russian woman treated me, wasted away and nothing but skin and bones, to millet gruel with milk somewhere in a Cossack village in the Kuban. She asked my mother to let her feed her starving little boy. "He will live...."

At that time Russia and Russian people saved the lives of million of just such refugees from the Ukraine.

I had a real argument with my acquaintance when he "touched" a sore spot: "But do you remember how they refused to accredit you in Lvov?" There was such an incident, and even now it makes me sick at heart. Fifteen years ago I was recommended as a special correspondent from *PRAVDA UKRAINY* to Lvov. The secretary for ideology of the party obkom [oblast party committee] at that time asked why the last name of the candidate ended in "ov." "Because he is Russian," came the answer. "No, such a candidate does not suit us...." And no assurances that the candidate knew Ukrainian and could freely communicate with the residents of the oblast were taken

into consideration. I went as representative of the newspaper to another western oblast of the Ukraine, Chernovtsy Oblast, where I was accepted very cheerfully and where I soon wrote a book on internationalist traditions in Bucovina and about how Russia contributed to the establishment of the textile industry there.

Then, 15 years ago, I viewed the position of the Lvov party obkom or, more accurately, of its official representative in the person of the obkom secretary, as a misunderstanding and as an absence of basic political culture. I knew that many Russians live in the Lvov region and that the Russian-speaking population was even larger. And I could not abandon my long-standing idea that until 1939 there had not been any problems in Russian-Ukrainian relations in Lvov.

But it turns out that a problem does exist. And it manifests itself not only in shouts such as, "Muscovites, get out of here!" The sources go much deeper. Proof of this is the very fact, for example, that the first sociopolitical conference "Ukrainian-Russian Relations in a Sovereign Ukraine" was held recently in the hall of the Lvov Oblast Soviet Executive Committee. Incidentally, in accordance with a proposal of the local "democrats" the participants of the conference were compelled to address one another as "Mr." and "Mrs." and "ladies and gentlemen."

There were numerous differences of opinion. In particular, V. Sulimov, executive secretary of the Russian Society imeni A.S. Pushkin, said, "The recognition of Russians as an ethnic minority under conditions of a struggle for the sovereignty of the Ukraine is a blessing for them." M. Khramov, deputy chairman of the provisional council of the Democratic Union of Youth in the Lvov Region said: "I would introduce the concept of a Ukrainian by conviction. Let everyone consider himself a Ukrainian who acknowledges Ukrainian citizenship, who knows the language and the history, and who has shared its pain and troubles." Other speakers frightened people with the inevitability of the appearance of an interfront and drove a wedge between the "westerners" and "easterners." The loudest speakers howled that the Russians in the Ukraine are living far better than the native Ukrainians.

But there was surprise for the participants of the conference themselves: A Ukrainian-Soviet consensus was achieved. And on this level the Lvov conference can be considered successful. In any event, a beginning is reassuring. But it is a long way to a consensus on the ethnic question outside the walls of the session hall of the oblast soviet executive committee. Unfortunately, not only in the Lvov region.

There are more than 11 million Russians in the Ukraine—one-fifth of the population of the republic. And in all there are more than 14 million "Russian-speakers." I put that word in quotation marks because I do not like it at all. It is not included in any dictionary. It has only appeared in wide usage recently, during the

years of perestroika. But it has quickly gained an emotional tone, and at rallies it is being used as an insult. This means that someone prefers it that way, especially when the subject touches upon languages. That is, that area where the modern "democrats" like to muddy the waters on ethnic sentiments. They say that the Ukraine is languishing from a Russian-speaking invasion and that it is necessary to save the Ukrainian nation.

It is a pity that those who groan loudest of all on this count are people who, by the activities they perform, would seem to be enlightened humanitarians. They weigh on the consciousness of the masses and summon them to a total rebuff of "Russian-speakers." Do you want examples? I have as many as you please. In the middle of the summer last year the press published an "Appeal of the Kiev City Soviet Commission on Ethnic Questions..." to parents, proposing that they register children in Ukrainian classes and threatening that all secondary and higher educational institutions in the republic will undergo full Ukrainianization by 1994 and that Russian language and Russian culture in the Ukraine will be uprooted (which is coming true as we watch!).

V. Strutinskiy, a corresponding member of the Ukrainian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] Academy of Sciences and a Ukrainian, commented on individual provisions of the "Appeal" in the following manner: "In its theoretical portion, it rests upon the notorious thesis of 'a criminal action to undermine Ukrainian ethnic culture across our entire history, beginning with the 1863 Valuyev circular and ending with the Brezhnev-Suslov directives which, under the banner of "internationalism," spread ethnic nihilism, rootlessness, and atheism, and cultivated a complex of second-class ethnicity"' etc.

The content, the vulgar tone of a rally, says the scholar in a letter, and the very restriction of "our" history to the aforementioned events and dates does not leave the impression of a document prepared by cultured people. Furthermore, the use of Russian always was an integral part of the culture of the people of the Ukraine and is not the result of imperial Russian policy. The authors of the "Appeal" are hoping that the reader, unfamiliar with the history of the people of the Ukraine and their culture and, in particular, with the content of the notorious Valuyev act, will believe in the existence of "a criminal action."

The authors of the "Appeal" are also counting on the fact that many people do not know the history of the migratory processes on the territory of the republic in the distant past and of the settlement of the territory of the republic's eastern portion; that people do not know when the contemporary territory of the Ukrainian SSR was defined and the fact that up to half of it consists of land won "by the Russian empire in imperialist wars" from Turkey and the Tatars. Up until then neither Ukrainians nor Ukrainians in general lived there (read M. Grush-evskiy on this—Author). That the majority of the Left Bank region of the Ukraine (the area around Sloboda),

south of it, and the Crimea were settled by Ukrainians when these lands were already part of Russia and where a significant Russian settlement was already springing up; that the present-day cities of Kharkov, Dneprodzherzhinsk, Kirovograd, Mariupol, Sevastopol, Kherson, Nikolayev, Odessa, Lugansk, and Dnepropetrovsk were founded almost simultaneously in 1750-1795 by ukases of the Russian empress on new lands of the empire; that the population of Kiev always was mixed, predominantly Ukrainian and Russian, and that the Russian language was used in Kiev over the course of the entire history of the city; and that in the central, eastern, and southern and often in the Western Ukraine the local population used Russian alongside popular Ukrainian. Where in all of this is there "genocide," and what constitutes a "criminal offense?"

It is surprising, but it is as if the members of the aforementioned commission of the Kiev City Soviet have forgotten (or perhaps they do not know) their own history. They have forgotten that all of us—Russians, Ukrainians, and Belorussians—come from a single home whose name is Kievan Rus. At the very least they should glance in the "Bolshaya Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya," where it says that the origin of the ancient Russian state dates to the ninth century. But indications of the existence of a "Ros" people appear in historical sources even in the sixth century. These are our roots! And when one hears the hysterical cry of "Russian occupiers!" one feels sorry for those who cry it—they simply do not remember their kinship. They never knew of it.

No one denies the need for democracy, freedom of speech, and freedom of religion. And for personal freedom and freedom of conscience. And suddenly we begin to build obstacles. But does anyone have the right, even the Law, to deprive a person of the choice of using one language or another? It would be unjust to assert that those who speak Russian encounter discrimination everywhere in the Ukraine. But there is quite a bit of noise around the issue. Quite recently society was taken aback by—whom would you suspect?—the Main Council of the Society of the Ukrainian Language imeni Taras Shevchenko, "Prosvita." It also adopted the soulful "Appeal." And it makes unfounded assertions that Ukrainian-language newspapers in the southern and eastern oblasts of the republic... are translated into Russian-language newspapers en masse. It says that in general the information market is overloaded with newspapers and journals published in Russia. How awful it is that many readers subscribe to such publications as OGONEK, ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, IZVESTIYA, TRUD, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, and the Russian-language version of VECHIRNIY KIYEV.... The radio station Mayak in Russian should be included. In short, an offensive.

Refuse them, tax them, refuse to allot them paper—these and other demands of "Prosvita," according to the Main Council of the Society, will fundamentally change the situation. If one follows the logic of the initiators of the

"Appeal," then one might also ask the following questions: Why is it that the Russian audience does not have its own channel or editorial staff on republic television? Or on republic radio either? In an enormous republic only one literary and social journal, RADUGA, is printed for the Russian-speaking population, and it has a miserly circulation. There is no children's literature to be found at all....

We do not need opposition but rather consolidation. In all the spheres of public life. And in the ethnic sphere. Corresponding member V. Strutinskiy spoke well on the subject: "Multilingualism and multiethnicity are the pride and the future of the Ukraine. Let us not turn into narrow-minded, rootless people or blind weapons of aggressive nationalists."

For my own part I will add, "Mankind! Respond to your neighbor with good, and pay back good a hundred times over."

Caucasus

Further Reportage on South Ossetia Situation

'Vremya' on Tskhinvali Conflict

LD1804180391 Moscow Central Television Vostok Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Report by correspondent Parfenekov in Tskhinvali; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Parfenekov] This is how every morning begins in Tskhinvali, the capital of South Ossetia. People wait for news and reports about what has taken place overnight and what they can expect today. According to the information received from the operational group of troops stationed within the still functioning oblast committee building, the situation in Tskhinvali and in South Ossetia remains extremely tense.

We have become accustomed to such a phrase during the almost six months during which the conflict has been going on here, and we take it as almost mundane. However, it is necessary to spend some time here to understand the sorrow of these people. The town is without electricity, heating, and water and it has limited food rations. Enterprises are not functioning and agricultural work has practically ceased. The number of refugees from the settlements near Tskhinvali is increasing every day.

[Unidentified speaker] One hundred and forty-six houses were burned down in our village, 146 houses, like my house which you can see now.

[Parfenekov] Houses are burned down, cattle are driven away, and civilian residents are killed. Even those who would like to work in the fields or the vineyards cannot do so out of fear for their own lives and the lives of those close to them.

They are called by many names—soldiers, informals, and members of independent armed units. They act and act with equal severity against both the Georgian and Ossetian sides. They are armed with automatic firearms and explosives. Today there was another operation to confiscate these illegally obtained and hidden weapons from an Ossetian group in Tskhinvali itself, and as you can see, not without success. Where do you think that this entire arsenal was discovered? Do not be surprised, it was in the town's Pioneer camp. A couple of days ago, two cars were blown up using just such mines, and five people died. [Unidentified soldier] Some say that we are on the Ossetian side and others that we are on the Georgian side. This is not the point here. The fact is that these are criminals, plain and simple criminals. And you know, in my view, criminals do not have a nationality. Perhaps the army will be able to bring order. I think that now the time has come when in most cases, the army deals with everything.

Towns Reportedly Shelled

LD1804182691 Moscow TASS in English 1816 GMT 18 Apr 91

[Text] Moscow April 18 TASS—Fulfilling the presidential decree, Soviet Interior Ministry troops continue to disarm illegal armed groups in South Ossetia. Nevertheless, the situation there is still tense.

Tskhinvali was again intensively shelled from the village of Zemo-Nikozi on the night of April 16, a spokesman for the press centre of the Soviet Interior Ministry told TASS. A covering force made up of Interior Ministry troops was also fired at three times from that village. Soldiers had to open reply fire.

Participants in a massive rally held in Tskhinvali positively assessed the performance of Soviet Interior Ministry troops in South Ossetia. They expressed protest against the policy, pursued by the Georgian leadership.

According to the information of the North Ossetian Interior Ministry, received by TASS in Vladikavkaz, the village of Okona, Zaur region, and the villages of Balta and Kvaleti were intensively shelled on April 18. Some civilians were gravely wounded.

There are no lights on Tskhinvali streets at night, because electricity has not been supplied there for two weeks. Gas and water are being supplied with numerous interruptions. And still the first signs of normal life can be seen in the city despite these difficulties. Classes were resumed at secondary schools, grocery shops opened and bus traffic was restored in the centre of the city.

Hundreds of refugees from other districts and cities of Georgia are coming to the regional centre every day.

Villagers Block N Caucasus Highway

*AU1904085191 Tbilisi Domestic Service in Georgian
0400 GMT 19 Apr 91*

[Text] The situation in Samachablo [South Ossetia].

On 17 and 18 April, it was relatively quiet in Tskhinvali and the surrounding villages although sporadic firing was heard during the night.

As yet, the fate of [name indistinct] who was taken hostage by Ossetian extremists on 15 April is still not known. On 17 April, as a mark of protest, representatives of the village of Tamarasheni staged a sit-down on the North Caucasian highway and prevented the passage of military columns. The military promised the residents that they would take energetic measures in order to secure the release of their fellow resident who had been taken hostage.

State of Emergency Only Solution

*PM1204124991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
12 Apr 91 Second Edition p 3*

[Report by special correspondent G. Ovcharenko: "Who is Going to Take Steps?"]

[Excerpts] Tskhinvali—The last time I left Tskhinvali was on 5 March. They still had electricity and bread then, and some enterprises were operating. It was hoped that there would be fewer casualties and the wild, senseless internecine strife between the two peoples would cease.

This time I flew into Tskhinvali on 8 April. Enterprises were not operating. Power transmission line pylons had been blown up—South Ossetia was without electricity again. This happened after a convoy of 96 trucks carrying food and medicines had traveled from Dzhava to Tskhinvali on 7 April under the supervision of internal troops. They call it the "convoy of life" here. For more than three months people in Tskhinvali had been cut off from the outside world. [passage omitted]

I confess I flew into Tskhinvali assuming that there would be a state of emergency throughout South Ossetia. Particularly as the USSR Supreme Soviet had recommended that the country's president introduce one. But at the moment a state of emergency is operating only in Tskhinvali, where the Ossetians live. Bandits are on the rampage in villages with which there are not even any communications. In peacetime, live hostages are being exchanged for dead ones under the very gaze of peace-keeping soldiers toting assault rifles. People entering vineyards are being shot, as are those who take vacuum-packed bread from Germany into blockaded Tskhinvali. Terrible it is....

But it gets more terrible when you read the statement by the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia. I have before me the 9 April issue of the newspaper VESTNIK GRUZII. It carries an appeal by Z. Gamsakhurdia,

chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, to the USSR president and the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet. I am not going to cite this document, which is more like an ultimatum really. It is much the same as other statements by Zviad Gamsakhurdia, which call for confrontation and further bloodshed. But I will cite one point in full: "The Roskiy pass and tunnel are to be closed and abolished." On reading this I am reminded of Saltykov-Shchedrin: Even he could not have anticipated such petty tyranny. "Close and abolish" a highway, thanks to which people in Tskhinvali are still able to exist somehow? Could there be a more sacrilegious appeal?

The latest news is that in the past 24 hours, in the course of operations to disarm illegal armed formations, 43 people have been arrested. Two scout cars, 110 guns, grenades, five radio sets of various types, and around 6,000 cartridges have been seized. One gunman was killed and two were wounded.

That is the situation in South Ossetia at the moment. I do not think it will get any better unless a state of emergency is declared throughout the region.

Gamsakhurdia: Shevardnadze Not Welcome

*PM0504083891 Stockholm DAGENS NYHETER
in Swedish 3 Apr 91 p 8*

[Disa Hastad report: "Georgian Independence Can Wait"]

[Text] Tbilisi—Former dissident and political prisoner Zviad Gamsakhurdia rules Georgia. This is the great change since last fall's election when the Communists were beaten and he became president.

Otherwise very little seems to have changed since I was first here 15 years ago. The Georgian capital is still shabby—even more so than before, if that is possible—the market more wretched. The newly permitted private enterprise is modest and keeps to the arcades.

Georgian flags—wine-red, with one white and one black corner—do indeed fly overhead, but I expected more of them.

Georgia declared itself a free republic after the revolution, but soon the Soviet Army occupied the country once again.

Will Georgia now declare itself independent immediately? No, so far Zviad Gamsakhurdia and his government have attempted to maneuver somewhat more skillfully than the Balts, for example. Last fall Gamsakhurdia declared that there would first be a "transitional period," but he has not said how long it will be. However, after Sunday's referendum some legislators thought that the declaration of independence could come more quickly.

Gamsakhurdia himself does not say very much about his plans—whether out of cunning or out of political inexperience. His statements are always very general.

On referendum day he received me at his family home on a hilltop amid a jumble of old houses. Gamsakhurdia's father was a well-known writer, and a bronze statue of him stands at the corner of the street.

The reason why Gamsakhurdia was able to put himself at the head of a party and win the election is that he is an anticommunist. Perhaps the election victory was also due to the fact he comes from a well known family.

What happens when you take power in a Soviet republic?

"There are still Communists occupying their posts. We did not have a purge. I do not know how many had to go, but it was hund —not thousands. Those remaining are specialists, and they do perhaps sabotage things a little, but do no damage," the president replied.

Gamsakhurdia is maneuvering his way. He refused to sign a declaration stating that the Soviet Army has occupied Georgia, as the opposition wanted him to do. That is also the official view.

Gamsakhurdia has said that he does not want to meet with Gorbachev until he is the leader of a free Georgia. That is why he has a vice president dealing with relations with the central government.

For the time being, at least, Gamsakhurdia is officially only the chairman of the Supreme Soviet, like Yeltsin and other republic leaders. Asked whether he does not want to be a president elected by the people, he replied evasively.

"It is by no means certain that the people would want to elect me."

However, the new parliament is writing a new Constitution, and in a free Georgia there will be a directly elected president.

The only opposition in parliament is a fairly small group of intellectuals who reproach Gamsakhurdia for his populism and Messianic ideas about Georgia, his isolationism and humorlessness.

"Because of the family he comes from, it would be no problem for him to surround himself with competent people. But he wants to work alone," someone I talked with said.

There are also people in Tbilisi who would have nothing against former Communist leader Eduard Shevardnadze's returning to Georgia. After all Shevardnadze has no job at the moment.

"We could do with him now, and he would probably come if we called him. But I do not think that there is a majority in favor of this," one person said.

If you ask Gamsakhurdia about his relations with Shevardnadze you received a clear negative response. After all, it was Shevardnadze who was responsible for Gamsakhurdia's imprisonment as the chairman of the Helsinki Committee in the seventies:

"Shevardnadze has no business here. He was a terrible dictator, corrupt. If he says that he started perestroika he is lying. It was only after he left Georgia that it became possible to get rid of the Communists."

Georgian 20 Mar Law on Changes to Constitution

AU1504120191 Tbilisi VESTNIK GRUZII in Russian
3 Apr 91 p 1

[Law signed by Z. Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia, in Tbilisi on 20 March: "Law of the Republic of Georgia on the Introduction of Changes and Amendments to the Constitution of the Republic of Georgia"]

[Excerpts] The Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia resolves:

to introduce into the Constitution of the Republic of Georgia the following changes and amendments:

1. to change the wording of Article 1 as follows:

"Article 1. The Republic of Georgia is a democratic rule-of-law state that expresses the common will of the population of Georgia and guarantees the defense of the interests of all its citizens irrespective of their nationality and faith.

The territory of the Republic of Georgia is integral and indivisible."

2. To remove Article 19.

3. to change the wording of Article 31 as follows:

"Article 31. In the Republic of Georgia as a sovereign state, citizenship of the Republic of Georgia is determined by the legislation of the Republic of Georgia.

Taking into account the primacy of the citizenship of the Republic of Georgia, a citizen of the Republic of Georgia is, in the transitional period, at the same time, a citizen of the USSR.

The citizen of another Union republic that forms a part of the USSR cannot, at the same time, be a citizen of the Republic of Georgia.

A citizen of another Union republic that forms a part of the USSR enjoys the same rights and bears the same responsibility on the territory of the Republic of Georgia as citizens of the Republic of Georgia except for those rights and obligations that are established in the legislation of the Republic of Georgia only for citizens of the Republic of Georgia.

Citizens of the Republic of Georgia who are abroad are entitled to protection from the Republic of Georgia and the USSR." [passage omitted]

[Signed] Z. Gamsakhurdia, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic of Georgia
Tbilisi, 20 March 1991

NKAO Republic Committee Member on Goals

91US0411A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 28 Mar 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with M.I. Radayev, member of the NKAO Republic Organizational Committee, by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Colonel V. Kaushanskiy in Stepanakert; date not given: "Hope Dies Hard"]

[Text] "The situation in the oblast remains tense; the forces protecting law-and-order are in control..." When one reads these particular lines in operations summaries from the NKAO [Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast], one is reassured. However, it is known that Karabakh is like a continuously erupting volcano which is absolutely unpredictable. The next summary may add to the list of innocents who have perished. March saw shootings on the Shusha-Stepanakert road, bloody fire-fights between two opposing sides (four dead and five wounded), an act of sabotage which disrupted the water supply in the aforementioned Shusha, bursts of automatic-weapons fire at a military patrol in Lachin, and an explosion at an electric substation in the village of Imarat-Gervend, Mardakertskiy Rayon.

Even a conversation between KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent Colonel V. Kaushanskiy and M. Radayev, member of the NKAO Republic Organizational Committee, was interrupted in the most unexpected manner: The lights went out in Stepanakert. Matvey Ivanovich, who was prepared for all kinds of surprises, silently brought out a "miner's lamp" and lit the wick with his lighter. The conversation went on.

[Kaushanskiy] Matvey Ivanovich, your name is not yet widely known to readers of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA. Would you please introduce yourself.

[Radayev] I am the son of a peasant who fought in the Great Patriotic War. I am an agronomist by education. I was born in the village of Ivanovka, Ismailinskiy Rayon, Azerbaijan. Russians have lived in the village for more than two centuries and, you know, they have preserved all the traditions and customs of their people. Even weddings are conducted there according to native Russian rites. By today's standards, my background is that of an "apparatchik." I moved from Komsomol [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] to party work. For eight years, I worked as second secretary of the Nakhichevan Oblast Party Committee, and subsequently I did economic work. I also happened to work in Democratic Yemen. Upon my return, I transferred to the organization of the Agroindustrial Committee. Since November 1990, I have been deputy chairman of the Azerbaijan Council of Ministers. My roots are in the Caucasus, and for this reason I feel the grief of the two clashing brethren as I would my own pain.

[Kaushanskiy] However, at present the brethren in the NKAO do not consider themselves such. This is indicated not only by the casualties but also by the abrupt

polarization of the demographic situation, which we would like to know more about.

[Radayev] This polarization is not as abrupt as it is made out to be. Indeed, on the map of the oblast we can point out the rayons with Armenian populations (constituting a majority) and those with Azeri populations. However, it is not that unequivocal. We are actually looking at the geography of a quilt whimsically pieced together from different patches of fabric. For example, Stepanakert is populated by Armenians. However, the settlement of Kirkidzhan is immediately adjacent to it, and this means almost 1,600 Azeris who have remained by their native hearths regardless of everything. Or else let us look at Mardakertskiy Rayon. It is considered to be mostly Armenian. However, there are small islands in it, the Azeri villages of Srkhavend, Kazanchi, Agdaban, and others. There are Armenian villages in the Azeri "patches." They have intertwined, and their vineyards and human destinies have grown together. This has emerged historically. Quite recently, a bridegroom did not ask his bride what her ethnic background was. This would have been preposterous. Mixed marriages were considered to be natural. To this day, old people from the two feuding camps secretly meet with one another. They drink to the good old times, and cry on one another's shoulders. Later, they once again retire to their corners. Cutting through live flesh is a bitter and painful experience. The rural soviet chairman from an Armenian village (with all due respect, its name is not to be mentioned in the press for security reasons) told me that their Azeri neighbors deliver bread to them to this day. This is happening at the ground zero of intolerance. The kindness of the people is ineradicable, and it does not depend on political trends. This is why we are trying to do whatever we can to make the neighbors reconcile and fraternize again.

[Kaushanskiy] However, are these efforts effective? As far as I know, the Armenian population does not recognize your committee, and at times altogether sabotages it. The building in which you work is surrounded by the armored personnel carriers of the USSR MVD [Ministry of Internal Affairs]. Do you feel that the current power structure in the NKAO is unsteady? Is there any opportunity at all to reinforce the legal foundation of this structure? Pencil in hand, I have studied an entire package of documents on Nagorno-Karabakh adopted in recent years by both Union and republic echelons. This is a tall stack of papers. However, the confrontation has not abated. Moreover, it has become continuous.

[Radayev] When laws are at odds the people also clash. This is one of the bitter lessons learned from the existing situation. Let us recall certain things. In January 1989, the NKAO Special Administration Committee was formed. In the process, the status of Nagorno-Karabakh as an oblast within Azerbaijan was legally affirmed. In November of the same year, the USSR Supreme Soviet abolished the ineffective structure and resolved to set up the current republic organizational committee on a parity basis. On 1 December of the same year, 1989, the

Armenian Supreme Soviet adopted an anti-constitutional resolution on the unification of Nagorno-Karabakh and the Armenian SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. In January of the next year, a resolution of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo on the restoration of the Nagorno-Karabakh Party Oblast Committee followed. The organs of state power and government in the autonomous oblast were to be likewise restored. It was proposed that representation of the Armenian and Azeri segments of the population be ensured in proportion to their numbers. Once again, there was a hitch. Finally, the January decree of the country's Supreme Soviet Presidium on imposing a state of emergency in the oblast and some other rays followed. However, fire did not cease.

[Kaushanskiy] Incidentally, the parity principle in the republic organizational committee has not been observed. There is not a single representative of the Armenian community among your colleagues.

[Radayev] Parity? Even before we went to our work stations, we were subjected to obstruction by the former leaders of the oblast, particularly USSR people's deputies, including Zoriy Balayan who has engaged in vigorous activities in Armenia, the Union parliament, and beyond the boundaries of the country. In a show of good will, we immediately proposed the following: Let us set up an organizational committee with a ratio of eight to eight, let us stop the escalation of fear right away, and restore government structures. The Armenian side refused. We are now in the second year of working with the present composition. To be sure, our neighbors say that they are in favor of restoring the oblast soviet of people's deputies, but... without electing them to the parliament of Azerbaijan. That is, the jurisdiction of the republic over the NKAO is categorically rejected. A vicious circle has emerged in which we walk to the sound of shots and explosions.

[Kaushanskiy] However, as you recall, the USSR law on the legal regimen of a state of emergency dated last April was added to the string of documents. It was supposed to bring an end to the

[Radayev] Yes, in theory. However, all of the fairest measures are hampered by the people who have no respect for the law. I am afraid that we will not get going as long as the package of documents is ignored and neglected in order to appease political ambitions. The immortal Chatskiy exclaimed on one occasion: "And who are the judges?" Perhaps real, rather than abstract, judges should sooner or later hold accountable under the law those who view democracy as the destruction of the legal foundation of our common Union, shielding themselves with deputy credentials in the process. In the case of the NKAO, the names of the people who could be held accountable are known.

[Kaushanskiy] Unfortunately, this destruction affects the economic sphere of the state as well. How would you view the condition of the economy of Nagorno-Karabakh at present?

[Radayev] After a series of strikes, enterprises have been observing operations schedules since March of last year. Considerable financial means have been marshaled to the oblast. We have received 2,250 railroad cars with construction materials. We have done everything to avoid disruptions in the supply of foodstuffs and fuel. However, there is little to reassure us. Industrial production has declined by a factor of almost two. The output of meat and grapes has declined. In the last two years, not a kilogram of grain, tobacco, or silkworm cocoons has been sold to the state. The cattle herd has declined. Peasant farms are being truly ruined. Who benefits from this—the Armenians, the Azeris? Here is one more fruit of impunity for you. However, the economy in our region is strained on other scores as well. The republic pays 15 million rubles to maintain the MVD troops. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has already reported on the construction of an appropriately fortified five kilometer zone along the border with Armenia, and on the security detachments of the internal troops located here. You tell me: Are we rich enough to invest money in self-defense, and to put a burden on the budget by reinforcing special-missions militia detachments? After all, we are not defending ourselves against a foreign enemy, and this is happening in a time of peace rather than war! Do the "democrats" who visit the NKAO in order to later pour oil on the fire of enmity, as representatives of the "April" committee did, understand this? I read a report on their February press conference in the Central House of Writers and I was greatly surprised: Why was another injection of misinformation needed? Perhaps, it would have been worthwhile for the esteemed writers to spend at least one night at any security detachment, to look the children from both "banks" in the eye, and to walk through deserted villages in order to understand for the remainder of their lives that we cannot rub salt into the bleeding wounds of the two peoples, and we cannot offer improvisations on the topic of executioners and victims from the detached point of view of a business visitor.

[Kaushanskiy] Incidentally, Soviet Army troops deployed in the territory of the oblast and USSR MVD units have been drawn into the orbit of misinformation. They select quite insulting epithets for the troops, and against this background attempt to convince public opinion that only the departure of the military will make it possible to restore civil peace in the NKAO. What is your opinion?

[Radayev] I have already stated it in part. However, it is necessary to make it more specific. Please tell me whether without the help of the military it would have been possible to remove from the oblast more than 200 100-mm city-busting [gradoboy'naya] guns or missile launchers? Perhaps, the presence of the troops in the region is the greatest stabilizing factor. If they are withdrawn, little streams of blood will turn into rivers which will wash away all fortifications and border markers. Personally, I bow my head to the guys from Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, and other republics. Their task is bitter and thankless; it involves daily risk.

In January alone, the unending internecine war claimed the lives of more than 20 people, of whom four were servicemen. Who has the moral right to throw a stone at them? Who will commit a major sin by defaming those who are forced to stand as a live wall between clashing neighbors? I am convinced that they will yet write about the nobility and selflessness of these people, their humanity, and their gentleness in response to provocations. Ask peasants in burned-down and looted villages: Do they want the small security detachments, posts, and guard details guarding bridges and the most significant life-support facilities to leave? The people with shoulder boards are psychologically treated here as a remedy for fear. I would send the democrats of every stripe to look at the jackets of the servicemen, soaked with sweat during the harvesting campaign. It does happen that there is nobody to do the harvesting. Under these circumstances, the soldiers work the land, protect, and help without fail.

I appeal to the journalists once again: Do not write about the military based on absurd rumors. Come here, and live for at least two or three days with them, listen to what they say, and grasp the difficulties of their harsh everyday existence.

[Kaushanskiy] Finally, Matvey Ivanovich, do you believe that this nightmare will ever end? If yes, what sustains your belief?

[Radayev] A wise man said: Hope dies hard. I believe: After all, Armenian and Azeri veterans were able to shake one another's hands during recent negotiations.

Mutalibov Interviewed on Perestroyka *LD1804130991*

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian at 1400 GMT on 17 April broadcasts a 25-minute program entitled "Our Common Cause," in which an unidentified correspondent interviews Ayaz Mutalibov, President of Azerbaijan, for 20 minutes about his views on the current state of the USSR and the progress of perestroyka reforms. The program appears to have been recorded at the end of 1990, from some of the remarks concerning "next year."

In the first five minutes, A.Ya. Bagirov, Azerbaijan's minister of trade, talks about the increasing shortages of consumer goods in the shops; A.A. Dzhabarov, head of the Azneft (petroleum) production association, talks about problems of pollution; and K.S. Mamedov, deputy chairman of Azerbaijan's agroindustrial committee, notes that Azerbaijan sends three times as much food to other areas as it receives.

An unidentified correspondent then interviews Mutalibov, president of Azerbaijan, in an office. Mutalibov begins by saying that the people's living standards must be raised, otherwise their confidence will be lost. The old methods of slogans and appeals do not work and should be left to history. It is up to the people to realize its

responsibility to itself. Everybody is equally responsible for society's affairs. The correspondent then asks: "Mikhail Sergeyevich (Gorbachev) has spoken about the question of eliminating (the fact) that we have become accustomed to the center giving commands, to the center taking the lion's share of finances, to the center giving instructions, that without the center, nobody... and all the time, they complain about the center. The question is already settled, already the center is neither here nor there, so to speak, the republics themselves have to deal with things, and they have received full rights for this. Yesterday we were at Azneft, and in general it turns out that the situation is far from being as simple as it seems to the leadership of the country."

Mutalibov responds: "The question is too serious to reply to laconically. I would even say it is a complex question. Today there is no feeling that the republics have the full breadth of power. This sounds more like an assumption, a desire, rather than the reality. At the same time, the centripetal and the centrifugal forces have (?started grappling), a vacuum has formed. The ideas of sovereignty, of independence in the republics have, as they say, taken hold of the masses. What little has been given to the republics today does not satisfy the republics. The matter concerns full breadth of power, the right to tackle problems by our own efforts and to bear responsibility before our own people. I think that is a correct desire. In my view, it removes the mood of dependency for which the republics have in the past been reproached." On the other hand, says Mutalibov, there are matters, such as dealings with foreign states, which republics should leave to the country as a whole. "The task should, in my view, boil down to applying the efforts of the center and of the republics to enhance the level of discipline and production. What can we share today? We have nothing to share. Everybody is short."

Asked if his views have changed since he became president, Mutalibov says no, he is inclined toward a civilized democracy. "I do not have in mind the level of the democracy which exists today in our country. I am not in agreement with such a democracy. This is rather an anarchy, I don't want to offend anarchists, not at all, but in the generally accepted sense of this word, that's the expression I would use. But democracy is the state of society where ethics of relationships predominate, the highest culture, and respect for laws. You will agree, we do not have that. Because that doesn't exist, then to reckon that we have achieved some kind of particular democratic transformations... we are only at the start of the road." Mutalibov says that the understanding of what democracy is and of the complexities involved in instituting it is growing. "Remaining a democrat, by the essence of my character, the way I am made, I try to apply the principles. They are very simple. There must be order and respect for the law, above all."

The correspondent asks: "Doesn't it seem to you that today, especially today, when the situation in the country

is quite difficult, we need strong authority? Strong and decisive authority, decrees and decisions which are mandatory?"

Mutalibov replies: "Certainly, yes. Although certain people are afraid of this expression, they reckon that this is a way to return to dictatorship, and via dictatorship to repressions and the such. I contemplate it calmly, because our people is different, it will never again allow what is the shame of our history, what we are still deprecating. But at the same time, there must be respect for authority, because power is not a permanent thing, attached to some specific personality, let's say. It is power via parliament, via a variety of opinion, via freedom of speech and so on. And so to fear that dictatorship will return together with a reinforcement of authority is incorrect. The political system which has already taken shape here excludes the use of power by the president, for example, for some particular ends of his own. One need not fear this. But to have authority, or order, to put it in other words, and give the president the opportunity to maintain that order, is the norm of any civilized state." A president must have ultimate authority, just as President Bush and Mitterrand have, to enable decisive action to be taken, Mutalibov says.

The correspondent then asks: "How do you feel, can the new body formed recently, the Federation Council, help the situation and state of affairs in the country?"

Mutalibov replies: "I hope so. The Federation Council, as a body for coordination and cooperation of the republics, is fully in line with the innovations that have emerged in our life in the sense of state structures. It is a new institution, of course it will accumulate experience and perfect its workings. But even going by the impressions that I have, in connection with the fact that I have attended these council meetings several times, the Federation Council is, in general, what we need today. The only thing that I would wish would be for the council to work in such a way that its decisions would be mandatory, that is, all members of the council, and, of course, the Federation Council should, I think, work together with the republican legislatures. One should not think at all that if there is some accord at the Federation Council, then this accord should be ratified in every republic, (as if at some kind of) international level. But this will come with experience. Meanwhile it is operating and operating not without success: We have the opportunity to say whatever we think, to make proposals, and these proposals are treated with respect, which is also good."

The correspondent says: "Excuse me, but you know the phrase—we express ourselves, we speak. In general, the people is so tired of talk, we talk at the soviet, the USSR Supreme Soviet, we talk at the sessions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet, that is, we talk and talk, but where's the result?"

Mutalibov replies: "Well, I think that something does come of it, although I am in solidarity with you in your definition that we talk a heck of a lot. But we were silent

for a long time, and we have to get the talk out of our system. At the same time, there is talk and talk. At the Federation Council, the talk is specific. On some issues, it is of a polemical nature, that is natural, but as for...for example, there was just a discussion of the economic agreement, there were different approaches in the republics, and these are natural, because not everything suited them in the agreement. But as a result of the talking, we arrived at an understanding that these contradictions had to be eliminated, and then we had to sign something. In this, you can't do without talking. But then something has to come of it. That is our job. I agree that we now have too much talking, but a search is in progress, and to some degree, it is natural. We simply have to speed up the transition to the phase of specific action, and in fact that is what the people are demanding."

The correspondent asks: "Ayaz Niyazovich, the council is headed by the president of the country. You are the president of a republic. What is the attitude of one president to another, what relationship do you have, where do your points of view coincide and where do they differ?"

Mutalibov replies: "Well, if I can push off with this idea of a council, a council is how I understand it, one consisting of personalities. Every member of the Federation Council has the right to express his point of view and to defend that point of view. Whether the president agrees with this point of view or not, it is the council which makes the decision in the final analysis. At the same time, one should not reckon that a member of the council has the right to a final opinion, so to speak, to disregard what the council thinks, or to ignore the president himself. The council ought to work on the principle of consensus. But meanwhile it is essential to take into account the opinion of every member of the council, and that of the president, naturally. That is, we ought to work as equals. At the Federation Council, one hears only the truth, because each of us is robbed both with power and with responsibility to the working people of our republic, to our peoples, and so there is no diplomacy here. As far as the president as a person is concerned, I consider that the more bitter the truth that he knows from us, the more quickly and the better he will find his bearings in the overall situation, and make the right decision. But as to whether one or another figure agrees or not with the president, here one could argue. Many in the republic, perhaps, don't agree with my actions, but the president is the president in order to make decisions sometimes, in keeping with the picture that seems to him most correct and objective, and for that reason I think it is wrong to deprive a president of that right." Mutalibov says that a clash of opinions is to be encouraged, but not a clash of personalities.

The correspondent then asks what Mutalibov's forecast for the coming year would be, since "they say it will be a very difficult year."

Mutalibov replies: "I would very much like to hope that these predictions won't come true, although there are

grounds to think it will be a difficult year. But I believe that the analysis of the events which have taken place in recent years, and the drafting of appropriate steps on the basis of the analysis, both in the center and locally, will make it possible to keep us all out of danger this year. I sense that a certain change is happening, such an understanding, because we simply cannot allow certain processes to go any further. And I think it would also be a mistake to reckon that these resources will find themselves in an evolutionary way. In such a vast country, patience, so to speak, of this kind, could end up in catastrophe. So it is time for decisive action. So don't misunderstand me, I am not presupposing any kind of extraordinary measures connected with a return to the past, so to speak, to command-administrative measures, oh no—but what I have in mind is resolutely relying on the people, on (its opinion), and conducting a clear policy, so that people know that, yes, there is a standpoint, there is a policy, there is firmness. That is something people want. This concerns all structures of government, from top to bottom. There is this desire among the people.

"At the same time, I am an optimist, I view the coming year with optimism, although it will be a difficult one. But nobody said that having been in one condition for 73 years, we could arrive at a qualitatively new, diametrically opposite condition in the course of five years. Perhaps, to speak by way of reproach for the highest leadership of the country, what I would say is this: the people should have been given a timescale, even if one for example only, for when we will sense (?progress) of perestroika, instead of making promises for one year to another, as has been done. I speak about this with indignation, because I have observed, and you have observed it, too, that in 1988, some of our academics thought something up, and straight away our propaganda declared that in 1989 a package of some miraculous reforms would be implemented, and we would come to life. Come 1989, and nothing happened; the people became apathetic. Well, the people have to be shaken out of apathy somehow. So let's think of something else, and so let's... aha! In 1989, another package, for 1990. Then 1990 is even worse. Now we are saying that we will come to life from 1 January because we are going over to the market. That's just nonsense, it cannot be so.

"On the contrary, one must say that we still have many long years to get to the market, and in general, we are not ready for the market, we are not ready today, either. But we desire to arrive at a market, like the market which is established in civilized states. But it is not a panacea for all our ills. And it is not the magic wand that will cure our society. It means a lot of difficult and complicated work. We have to talk about this openly and frankly. I think that making promises of things is the most unpopular thing. In view of the variety of problems which worry the people and myself as a citizen, it is not even so much the fact that today we are short of foodstuffs and that the shop shelves are empty, but that we don't have elementary confidence in tomorrow. We are all anxious, all of

us, as citizens, we do not know what is going to happen to us and to our children. Let's put it this way, not me as president or you as a senior member of Central Television staff, but simply as citizens, there is such an anxiety. What is important today is to insure order, and then everything comes via this."

The correspondent says: "Forgive me, but can we go back a little, using the words you just said about the people wanting firm authority, the people wanting hardness. How do you see yourself as a president in this direction, your own behavior? You are a person who is... we have known each other quite a while, I know that you are an intelligent man, a man of mild enough nature, but sometimes you have to bang your fist, and sort of..."

Mutalibov interjects: "Mildness expresses itself in purely human relationships. A rude person is in general not what is required, if you deal with people you have to be all right. But when I am performing my functions, there can be no question of mildness. There has to be hardness in your position, and this has to be sensed. I cannot say that I am so far along in displaying these qualities, by way of self-criticism. I even know that many would like me to be harder, that opinion exists in our own republic, and so, in 1991, in view of the fact that it will be particularly intensive, I think it will be for me a year of more resolute actions, more hardness, more adherence to principle, greater demandingness—within certain limits, of course, and not going beyond these limits, certainly."

The correspondent asks: "In your opinion, what should the government do to improve the situation in the country in the near future?" Mutalibov says: "What needs to be done? We must attain the level of national gross product, in terms of goods, a level which would at least provide for elementary needs, I am not talking about elegant living, but the elementary requirements of society. How to do this without returning to a command-administrative system, that is the task. It seems to me that we must drastically increase the responsibility of labor collectives to the state. We can no longer say that we have department-run, state egotism. Today it has been replaced by group-based egotism. I can do all right, I might take on some task I can do, and by manipulating prices extort quite a good wage, without thinking about the fact that it is not at all covered by any real product, and there you are. And that is the most harmful thing. You have to think here; and when I speak of a drastic increase in discipline, I have in mind the discipline of labor collectives. Yes, today their interests are protected by the law. Nobody has the right for such voluntaristic interference. But society does have it. If some particular works is today producing less than it produced five years ago, then one has to ask why, and not be embarrassed about doing so. For if we can raise our national gross product, and what is produced from it, the national income is directly connected to this parameter, then the budget will be filled and the republics will have something to share out. Otherwise we will all be trying to pull the blanket over to our own side, and tear it to shreds. That's what I think."

Central Asia

Nazarbayev Cited on Possible Price Increases

PM1804121991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
15 Apr 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Yerlan Bayzhanov: "Kazakhstan May Increase Prices for Raw Materials"]

[Text] Alma-Ata—At a republic soviet session, N. Nazarbayev, president of the Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic], announced that unless Kazakhstan receives the funds envisaged for 1991 in the interim economic agreement it will be forced to increase sharply the price of many types of raw materials sold outside the republic.

N. Nazarbayev, president of the Kazakh SSR, announced this at an out-of-town session of the republic soviet, which took place in Aktyubinsk. Economic questions dominated the discussion: The results of the first quarter's work, preparations for the spring field work, and the population's provision with foodstuffs.

The agenda included elaborating an emergency republic budget. The government will examine a substantial increase in the prices of raw materials as one emergency measure.

It was noted that production has fallen in Kazakhstan. N. Nazarbayev has obtained assurances from the oblast leaders that food crop sowings will not be reduced. This year the republic faces a feasible task: providing itself with groats and potatoes. Hope is also pinned on city dwellers: They are to be allocated over 300,000 hectares of market garden and dacha plots.

CPSU'S Dzasokhov Cited on Talks in Kazakhstan

LD1704175491 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 1530 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Report by correspondent D. Baymbetov in Alma-Ata; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Dzasokhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee on International Affairs, secretary and member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, is in Alma-Ata for the second day.

[Baymbetov] Gathering its highest economic council economists of international and national renown, Kazakhstan is the first in the country to begin implementing an anticrisis program: the reorganization of the structure of power, privatization, laws on entrepreneurship, on free economic zones. Enterprises which have acquired independence—like the Alma-Ata furniture association (Mirey), which decided to buy out the enterprise on a full collective ownership basis—are becoming enterprising. How can the production of such comfortable furniture be increased? What measures are to be taken to stabilize economic and social life? These and other issues were

discussed with workers by Aleksandr Sergeyevich Dzasokhov and the president of Kazakhstan, Nursultan Abishevich Nazarbayev.

[Begin Dzasokhov recording] Now, at last, neither the worker nor the engineer will hide what they are thinking. They speak out. And then we get to know real life better. This is the merit of any trip. It is pleasant to see that despite all our ills—economic and others—nevertheless both the workers and the leadership of the association see the prospects and are trying to carry out a very necessary creative mission. We are now very concerned about the problems of social protection, especially for those categories of the population who need this. We are of course interested in maintaining attention toward the older generation, toward pensioners. Our task as political workers is, without hiding anything, to truthfully explain the essence of the decisions which are being taken. [end recording]

[Baymbetov] There was a discussion in the republic's Academy of Sciences on increasing the effectiveness of scientific inventions and their practical return. Apart from this, Comrade Dzasokhov's itinerary contains meetings with the student youth of Kazakhstan, the ideological aktiv of the city and oblast, and with students of the Institute of Political Science. [video shows Dzasokhov attending other meetings]

Kazakh Anti-Nuclear Movement Implements Programs

LD1804161791 Moscow TASS in English 1358 GMT
18 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Almat Temirbekov]

[Text] Alma-Ata April 18 TASS—Activists from the Nevada-Semipalatinsk anti-nuclear movement embarked on the implementation of a large-scale programme renaissance. It is aimed at the restoration of the environment, socio-economic and moral life of the Kazakh people who suffered the consequences of nuclear tests at the Semipalatinsk range over many years.

Scientists from the Leningrad State University of Technology and specialists of the Kazakh Design Institute for the Enrichment of Non-ferrous Metallic Ore began work to create and install equipment to obtain pure drinking water in the Kzyl-Orda district and Semipalatinsk, Pavlodar and Karaganda regions where fresh water is scarce.

"No one public movement can cope with financing such programmes. So we turned for assistance to the large enterprises operating in Kazakhstan," Galina Kuzembayeva, executive secretary of the central office of Nevada-Semipalatinsk movement, told TASS.

Large industrial associations in the republic sponsored the renaissance foundation.

The movement's activists continue to expand international ties. Physicians from Australia and a number of other countries were invited to work in medical centres.

Kazakh specialists visit foreign countries to gain experience. A prominent physician from South Korea Yong Lim contributed two million dollars to build a children's hematological centre in the suburbs of the Kazakh capital.

The renaissance programme includes "save a child" humanitarian action. More than 200 children with severe forms of leukemia need urgent treatment. Therefore, Nevada-Semipalatinsk movement urges scientists, medics and the general public to participate in the action to help save the children.

Kyrgyz President Criticizes Draft Union Treaty

LD1704192791 Moscow World Service in English
1600 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Text] The president of Kyrgyzstan, Askar Akayev, in a speech in the republican parliament voiced serious amendments and critical remarks concerning the draft treaty of the Union. He believes that the draft fails to decipher the notion, the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics. [sentence as heard] The republican leader also disagreed with the priority of the Union over sovereign member states and with granting highest executive powers to the country's president.

After the draft treaty of the Union is discussed by the republican parliaments it will be finalized and signed.

Akayev Says Kyrgyzstan at 'Breaking Point'

LD1004155191 Moscow TASS in English 1338 GMT
10 Apr 91

[By TASS correspondent Svetlana Ogibalina]

[Text] Bishkek April 10 TASS—The economic and social situation in Kyrgyzstan has reached a breaking point, beyond which there could be a political explosion, said Kyrgyz President Askar Akayev, describing the situation in the republic at a recent meeting with the republican government.

The president called the cabinet members' attention to the drop in the economic growth and the overall fall of industrial and agricultural production. The output of meat in the republic dropped by 20 per cent, milk—13 and eggs—17 per cent.

According to Akayev, if this situation persists, hunger will strike the republic in the winter of 1991-1992.

He said that the first months of the government's work showed the inefficiency of its structure. Some ministries were re-organised without proper grounds. Economic associations, concerns and consortiums were set up without sufficient forethought.

The president proposed to the government his own programme to improve the republican economy. It would prioritise the countryside, privatise small enterprises in the service sector and foster close economic and humanitarian cooperation with foreign countries.

Tajikistan's Makhkamov on Price Reform Impact

LD1704175591 Moscow Central Television Vostok
Program and Orbita Network in Russian
1530 GMT 17 Apr 91

[Report by correspondent N. Nikulin in Tajikistan; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Kakhar Makhkamov, Tajikistan's president, has signed a number of decrees and decisions aimed at social protection of republican residents in relation to the retail price reform.

[Nikulin] There are more than 100,000 mothers who do not work with five or more underage children in Tajikistan today. Because of a new decision by the republican Cabinet of Ministers, each of them will receive R50 [rubles] monthly. Incidentally, this category of the population was not taken into account in the Union decision. Following new decrees and decisions, prices on goods for children, flour, bread, and bakery products have been lowered. The five percent sales tax has been removed from a considerable group of both food and industrial goods. Salaries of those working within the system of the Academy of Sciences have been considerably increased. Students of higher educational establishments and technical schools will get a monthly allowance of R30 on top of the compensation of R60 that is paid.

All in all, the republic is earmarking more than R350 million from its budget for additional target compensation. This was announced at a news conference by President Makhkamov of the Tajik SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic]. But the following fact is worrisome. Of the R2.08 billion set aside for compensation, the republic has not received a single kopek from the Union.

[Begin Makhkamov recording] We are a raw materials republic, as well as Uzbekistan, Turkmenia, Kyrgyzstan, and Kazakhstan. We are, in the main, raw materials republics, and the income received from the end product in the form of a turnover tax is channeled to other republics, such as Russia, the Ukraine, Belorussia, and the Baltic republics. Therefore, the Union...[changes thought] when we signed the economic treaty on transition to price reform...[changes thought] it was clearly and straightforwardly defined in the treaty who contributes to the compensation fund, what amounts, and who will receive this money. This data was published in the press. However, many republics have not paid their contribution to this fund. If this continues, we will have—we, the raw materials republics—will have to agree on what to do next. Are we going to dispatch our output at these fixed prices or should we, too, raise prices as a counter-measure since there is no revenue? But, this will be an economic war. Again, this will be a war of laws, an economic war. We must prevent this. [end recording]